



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XIX.—THE PROLOGUE TO THE *LEGEND OF*
GOOD WOMEN AS RELATED TO THE
 FRENCH *MARGUERITE* POEMS,
 AND THE *FILOSTRATO*.

In 1775 Tyrwhitt, speaking of the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*, suggested that "it is possible that *le dit de la fleur de lis et de la Marguerite* by Guillaume de Machaut . . . and the *Dittié de la flour de la Margherite* by Froissart . . . might furnish us with the true key to those mystical compliments, which our poet has paid to the Daysie-flower."¹ This suggestion of Tyrwhitt has been echoed and reëchoed by succeeding editors and commentators,² but has never been seriously put to the test. Godwin, in his *Life of Chaucer*,³ called attention to the story told in Froissart's *Dittié*, of the birth of the daisy from the tears shed by Herés on the grave of Cepheï, but did not connect it with the transformation of Alcestis into the daisy.⁴ Mr. Skeat, in his

¹ *The Canterbury Tales of Chaucer* (London, 1775), I, xxxiv-v, note. Tyrwhitt is disposing of the notion, first started by Speght—in the edition of 1602, not that of 1598—that under the name of the daisy was meant Margaret, Countess of Pembroke. See further on this identification, Urry, *Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (London, 1721) [iv-v]; Warton, *Hist. Eng. Poetry* (London, 1774), I, 466, note κ; Bell's *Chaucer* (London, 1855), IV, 250; Corson, *Chaucer's Legend*, etc. (Philadelphia, 1864), 7-8, 15.

² Even Mr. Skeat (*Oxford Chaucer*, I, 36) merely says: "I agree with him [Tyrwhitt] in supposing," &c. Cf. Düring, *Geoffrey Chaucers Werke* (Strassburg, 1883), I, 253-4; ten Brink, *Studien* (Münster, 1870), 158, 191; Morley, *Eng. Writers* (London, 1890), V, 133-4; Neilson, *Court of Love* (Boston, 1899), 144; Snell, *The Age of Chaucer* (London, 1901), 190-91; etc.

³ II (1803), 339-40; III (1804), 247.

⁴ Mr. Skeat (*Oxford Chaucer*, III, xxxii) credits Sandras (*Étude sur G. Chaucer*, 1859, p. 58) and Bech (*Anglia*, V, 363) with pointing out the Herés story. For once, at least, Godwin should be given his due.

discussion of the Prologue in the Oxford *Chaucer*,¹ pointed out three specific passages in Froissart and Machault which are more or less closely parallel with certain lines of Chaucer. Vollmer² added to Mr. Skeat's observations a reference to the *balade* at the close of Froissart's *Paradys d'Amours*. Beyond similar instances to these, no examination has apparently been made of Chaucer's indebtedness, in the Prologue, to the poems referred to. Yet such an examination seems to come very near doing just what Tyrwhitt suggested it might do, besides throwing welcome light on certain other problems connected with the poem.

I.

The two poems which Tyrwhitt mentioned, are the best known members of an exceedingly interesting group. During the years 1363 and 1364 the king of Cyprus, Pierre de Lusignan—"ce valeureux champion de conquêtes impossibles"—travelled through Europe, visiting the courts of France, Germany and England, in an effort to awaken the zeal of the princes to a fresh crusade.³ The closing months of 1363 he spent in England,⁴ where he was brilliantly entertained,⁵ and became the benefactor of Froissart.⁶ The

¹ III, xxxi; cf. xxxv.

² *Das mittellenglische Gedicht, The Boke of Cupide* (Berlin, 1898), pp. 101-2; see also Neilson, *Court of Love* (1899), 79, n. 1.

³ Froissart, *Chroniques* (ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, Brussels, 1870), VI, 362, 370-6, 378-87, 390, 393-6, 409-10, cf. 503-9; VII, 1-3; XVII, 400-404, 407; de Mas Latrie, *Histoire de l'île de Chypre* (Paris, 1852), II, 237-245, gives full details of the itinerary; cf. Delaville le Roulx, *La France en Orient au XIV^e Siècle* (Paris, 1886), I, 120 ff.

⁴ De Mas Latrie, *op. cit.*, 240; see Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.* (Rolls Series), I, 299; Knighton, *Chron.* (Rolls Series), II, 118; Froissart, ed. Kervyn, VI, 381.

⁵ "Je ne vous poroie mies compter en un jour les nobles disners, les souppers, les festyemens et les conjoissemens, les dons, les présens et les jeuiaux c'on fist, donna et presenta."—Froissart, ed. Kervyn, VI, 380.

⁶ Froissart, *Le Joli Buisson de Jonece*, 348-50 (*Oeuvres*, ed. Scheler, II, 11); see *Chroniques*, xx, 566.

same year he was present at Rheims at the coronation of Charles V,¹ for which occasion it has been thought that Guillaume de Machault, then a canon of the Cathedral, had composed the music of the mass.² Here in all probability, as Tarbé suggests,³ was begun the acquaintance between the two men, which led, after the tragic death of Pierre, to Machault's last work, *La Prise d'Alexandrie*, celebrating the crowning events of the king's career, "at Alisaundre . . . whan it was wonne."

Now there is much that leads one to suppose that Machault's *Dit de la Marguerite* was composed for Pierre de Lusignan, and that it celebrates one of his mistresses.⁴ The lady whom the daisy symbolizes—"Appellée est en françois Marguerite, C'est chose voire"⁵—is separated from her lover by the sea :

Car elle m'a gari d'oultre la mer
De ma doulour,⁶
Que d'oultre mer la voy en ma présence.⁷

More specifically, the lover himself is represented as being in Cyprus or in Egypt :

Et quant je suis en Chipre ou en Egipte,
Mes cuers en li tres doucement habite, etc.⁸

We may fairly infer, then, that the *Dit* was written some-

¹ Froissart, ed. Kervyn, VII, 1-3 ; XVII, 407 ; de Mas Latrie, *op. cit.*, II, 240.

² M. L. de Mas Latrie, *La Prise d'Alexandrie* (Guillaume de Machault), Geneva, 1877, p. xvi ; cf. Magnin in *Journal des Savans*, 1851, p. 406 ; Fétis, *Biog. universelle des Musiciens* (Brussels, 1837), IV, 465. The introduction of M. de Mas Latrie should be corrected, in general, by Gaston Paris' review in the *Revue historique*, IV (1877), 215 ff.

³ *Oeuvres de Machault*, ed. Tarbé (Reims and Paris, 1849), xxviii-ix.

⁴ Tarbé, *loc. cit.*

⁵ *Oeuvres*, ed. Tarbé, p. 129.

⁶ *Ib.*, 124.

⁷ *Ib.*, 127. Cf. also the following :

Et quant li vens de son dous pays vente
.
.
.
J'en sui plus sains (p. 126).

⁸ *Ib.*, 129.

where between 1364 and 1369—not improbably during the former year—and that instead of embodying a love-affair of Machault's own,¹ it connects itself with the king of Cyprus—or at least with some friend of the poet's who, like Chaucer's Knight, attended on the brilliant fortunes of the king.²

¹ Cf. Magnin in *Journal des Savans* (1851), 405: "M. de comte de Caylus s'appuie à tort d'un vers du *Dit* . . . pour prouver que Machault a été en Chypre et en Égypte. Il n'a pas remarqué que c'est Pierre de Lusignan qui est supposé parler dans cette pièce." Which one of the numerous Marguerites of the day the poem celebrates, one must leave undetermined. See Tarbé, 185–6, and note the list of Marguerites in the index to Du Cange's *Les Familles d'Outre-Mer*, ed. Rey (Doc. inédits, Paris, 1869), pp. 951–953.

² Tarbé (*Oeuvres*, xxix, n. 1) connects with the Marguerite poem "une maison de plaisance, qu'il nomma la Marguerite," which Pierre de Lusignan built in Cyprus, and refers to Machault as his authority. According to Machault (*La Prise d'Alexandrie*), in January, 1369:

Li gentis roys faire faisoit,
En un lieu qui moult li plaisoit,
Une maison toute nouvelle,
Qui devoit estre bonne et belle,
Car pas n'estoit oeuvre petite.
On l'apelloit la Marguerite. (ll. 8360–5.)

A few days before his assassination—January 17, 1369; see de Mas Latrie, *Hist. de Chypre*, II, 344–5—the Marguerite was still in his mind:

Ce fu fait le jour xiii^e
De janvier ou le jour xve.
Ce jour ala li roys jouer
Pour veoir et pour ordener
La maison de la Marguerite
Qu'au deviser moult se delite. (ll. 8574–9.)

The account thus given certainly seems to offer ground for the conjecture that the structure was "une maison de plaisance," and that its name may have had reference, like the poem, to a mistress of the king's. But Machault has entirely disguised the real and sinister significance of the building. "E per far," says Florio Bustron of the king, "un bel tratto a soi fratelli e altri de primarii, faceva fabbricare una torre, poco distante dalla cittadella, et la chiamò *la Margarita*, et haveva già fornito fondi di

The poem seems to have been almost immediately influential. When we turn to Froissart's *Dittié de la flour de la Margherite*, we find clear enough evidence that Machault's

quella. *La quale è una priggion sotto terra oscurissima*, et di muri grossissimi fatta, e profonda, dove pensava far di sopra anchora un'altra torre. . . . E voleva far di sopra la torre alta ; dove si lassò intender, che voleva far un convito, et retenir et incarcerarli tutti'' : Florio Bustron, *Chronique de l'île de Chypre*, ed. R. de Mas Latrie (*Mélanges Historiques*, Choix de Documents, Paris, 1886), v, 271 ; see also *Chronique de Machéras*, trad. franç. Miller et Sathas (Paris, 1882), 144-5 ; *Chronique de Strambaldi*, ed. R. de Mas Latrie (Doc. inédits, Paris, 1893), 102 ; *Chronique d'Amadi*, ed. R. de Mas Latrie (Doc. inédits, Paris, 1891), 422 ; Jorga, *Philippe de Mézières* (Paris, 1896), 387 ; Herguet, *Cyprische Königsgestalten des Hauses Lusignan* (Halle, 1881), 29. His brothers, however, warned by the king's confessor, escaped. But through this same tower of the Marguerite (which was so called from the hill of Sainte-Marguerite on which it stood ; see de Mas Latrie, *Histoire*, etc., III, 265, n. 3) came indirectly the king's own death. For he had, says Machault (*La Prise d'Alexandrie*, 8366-9) :

Il avoit là plusieurs esclaves,
Qui, dedens fossez, dedens caves,
Toute jour la terre fouoient,
Et hors, à leur col, la portoient.

It was while working barelegged among these slaves, where the king's "wilfulhed" had thrust her, that Marie de Giblet uttered to the nobles who took exception to her immodest garb, the stinging taunt—"Donne con donne non si vergognano di mostrar li piedi . . . et da voi . . . non mi curo, perchè tutti sette femine" (Bustron, 273)—which led to Pierre's assassination. The whole story is told with vivid detail by Bustron, *op. cit.*, 272 ff. ; Henrico Giblet, *Historie de' Re' Lusignani* (Bologna, 1647), 406 [printed 398]-408 ; Machéras, *op. cit.*, 145 ff. ; Strambaldi, *op. cit.*, 102 ff. ; Amadi, *op. cit.*, 422-4 ; cf. Jorga, *op. cit.*, 388 ; Herguet, *op. cit.*, 29-30. The dramatic story of the murder of the king is given in Bustron, 275-6 ; Giblet, 417 ff. ; Strambaldi, 112-14 ; Machéras, 159 ff. ; Amadi, 425-6 ; cf. Jorga, 390 ; Herguet, 30. Chaucer's statement of the case in the *Monk's Tale* (B. 3581-88) is curiously at variance with what seem to be the facts. The whole history of Pierre de Lusignan is of course of the utmost interest to students of Chaucer, not only on account of the passage referred to, but also for the background it gives to the description of the Knight, who was with him at Lyeys and Satalye, as well as at Alisaundre.

lines were in his mind as he wrote.¹ But Froissart's Margherite was not the Marguerite of Machault's poem. We are taken back at once to the love-story so charmingly related in *L'Espinette Amoureuse*²—the story of the maiden whom he found reading the *Cleomades*³—for at the close of *L'Espi-*

¹ See, for instance, the opening lines of Machault's *Dit* :

J'aim une fleur qui s'uevre et qui s'encline
Vers le soleil, de jour quant il chemine ;
Et quant il est couchiez soubz sa courtine
Par nuit obscure,
Elle se clost, ainsois que li jours fine.
Ses feuilles ont dessous *colour sanguine*,
Blanches dessous plus que gente hermine
Ne blancheur pure. (Oeuvres, 123.)

Compare, now, Froissart's *Dittié*, ll. 53 ff. (Oeuvres, ed. Scheler, II, 211) :

Car tout ensi que le soleil chemine
De son lever jusqu'à tant qu'il decline,
La margherite *encontre lui s'encline*,
Comme celi
Qui mousttrer voelt son bien et sa doctrine ;
Car le soleil, qui en beauté l'afine,
Naturellement li est chambre et courtine,
Et le deffent contre toute bruïne,
Et ses coulours de blank et de sanguine
Li paraccroist, etc.

Particularly, compare with the reference to Cyprus and Egypt in Machault (v. p. 595), the mention of Egypt dragged in by Froissart (ll. 19–21, II, 210) :

Ossi chier a le préel d'un hermitte,
Mès qu'elle y puist croistre sans opposite,
Comme elle fait les beaux gardins d' Egypte.

Note also the common rhymes—*delite, eslite, habite, petite*—of the last two passages. Compare the last two lines of the *Dit* with ll. 7–8 of the *Dittié* ; etc. For Machault's influence on Froissart, see further *Eng. Stud.*, XXVI, 336 ; Gröber, *Grundriss*, II¹, 1050 ; Sandras, *Étude sur G. Chaucer* (Paris, 1859), 78–9.

² *Oeuvres* (ed. Scheler), I, 107 ff.

³ See particularly Besant's chapter on "Froissart's Love Story" in *Essays and Historiettes* (London, 1903), 197–223 ; G. C. Macaulay's "Froissart the

nette we are told that the names of both lover and lady will be found :

En quatre lignes moult petites
Entre " nous fumes " et " le temps. " ¹

The lines are readily discovered :

Je hantoie là tempre et tart
Dont frois, dont chauds, navrés d'un dart
D'amours ; et lors de fleurs petites,
Violetes et margherites. ²

The name of the lady of *L'Espinette*, accordingly, was Marguerite—the Marguerite, we may be sure, of the *Dittié* itself,³ and without question the lady of the *Paradys d'Amours*, who makes for him the chaplet of *marguerites*,⁴ and in whose honor he sings the *balade* with the refrain : "Sus toutes fleurs j'aime la margherite."⁵ *L'Espinette* was written before November, 1373 ;⁶ the *Paradys* has been

Lover" in *Macmillan's Mag.*, January, 1895 (vol. LXXI, No. 423, pp. 223–30) ; Kervyn de Lettenhove, *Froissart, Étude Littéraire* (Bruxelles, 1857), I, 20–42 ; *Oeuvres de Froissart* (Bruxelles, 1870), I, 1^{re} Partie, 22–34, 60–66 ; Mary Darmesteter, *Froissart* (Paris, 1894), 10 ff. ; Gröber, *Grundriss*, &c., II¹, 1049–50 ; Petit de Julleville, *Hist. de la Langue et Litt. fr.* (Paris, 1896), II, 346 ; Dinaux, *Les Trouvères* (Bruxelles, 1863), IV, 487–499.

¹ Ll. 4141–4182 (*Oeuvres*, ed. Scheler, I, 209–10)—esp. 4178–9.

² Ll. 3380–3383 (I, 187). See Scheler (*Oeuvres*, I, 388–9), where this is pointed out, for the suggestion of the surname Vrediau. Kervyn de Lettenhove in his *Froissart* (1857), I, 29, gave a different reading of the name—as also Dinaux in *Les Trouvères*, IV, 497–8—but in his edition of the *Chroniques* (1870), I, 1^{re} Partie, 31, he accepts the reading given above. Cf. Gröber, *Grundriss*, II¹, 1050.

³ Note what Gröber (*op. cit.*, 1051), says of "die Jugenddichtung Loenge dou joli mois de May . . . unter dem Eindruck der schönen Jahreszeit einer Dame dargebracht, der ohne zweifel auch der *Dittié de la fleur de la Margherite* . . . , also der Jugendgeliebten, galt. Cf. pp. 1049–50.

⁴ *Paradys d'Amours*, 1620–26 (I, 48–9).

⁵ *Ib.*, 1627–53 (I, 49–50).

⁶ Compare *Le Joli Buisson*, 443 ff. (II, 14) with *ib.*, 859–60 (II, 26). See *Eng. Stud.*, XXVI, 327–9.

shown to antedate 1369.¹ In 1371,² moreover, in *La Prison Amoureuse*, Froissart, writing under the name Flos to an imprisoned friend whom he calls Rose,³ after rejecting the violet, the lily, and a succession of the very flowers subordinated to the daisy in the *balade* of the *Paradys*, takes for his device, and puts in a little ring of gold,

“ . . . une fleur petite
Que nous appellons margherite.”⁴

Nor does his diligence “in the honour Of love, and eek in service of the flour,” end here. In the seventeenth *Pastourelle*⁵ he writes a *débat*, in which once more the claims of the *marguerite* are defended against the pretensions of other flowers, with the refrain, “La margherite à la plus belle;” while one of the last of his poems, the *Plaidoirie de la Rose et de la Violette*,⁶ closes with the same motive. To the *cultus* of the *marguerite*, accordingly, Froissart, building on Machault, has made substantial additions.

¹ By Professor Kittredge in *Eng. Stud.*, xxvi, 321–336. See also Longnon’s introduction to Froissart’s *Meliador* (Paris, 1895), I, 1–li, and his reply to Professor Kittredge, *ib.*, III, 363–369.

² *Prison Amoureuse*, 2252–3 (I, 288).

³ Presumably Wenceslas of Brabant; see Gröber, *Grundriss*, II¹, 1050; Scheler, *Oeuvres*, II, 404; Kervyn de Lettenhove, *Froissart* (1857), II, 269–71, and in *Oeuvres* (1870), I¹, 264–5; Darmesteter, *Froissart* (Paris, 1894), 44; *contra*, Longnon in *Meliador*, I, lxvi ff.

⁴ *La Prison Amoureuse*, 852–903 (I, 240–41); esp. 898–9. Cf. the close of the letter, I, 247. Similarly, in the *Joli Buisson*, II, 1106–9 (II, 33), he tells us:

J’ai usage, quant je me lieve,
Afin que le jour ne me grieve,
De dire une orison petite
Ou nom de sainte Margherite.

⁵ *Oeuvres* (ed. Scheler), II, 343–6; cf. *Pastourelle*, XIX, with the refrain: “Un chapelet de margherites,” II, 348–50.

⁶ *Ib.*, II, 235–245—“der jüngste Debat Froissarts, nach 1392,” Gröber, *Grundriss*, II¹, 1052. See p. 617, n. 1, for the lines.

We should expect to find Deschamps—who speaks of Machault as

Noble poete et faiseur renommé

.
Qui m'a nourry et fait maintes douçours¹—

influenced by the *Dit de la Marguerite*. And, in fact, the description of “la tresdouce flour” in the *Lay de Franchise*,² simply carries one step further the symbolism of the older poem.³ In like manner the *balade*, No. 539—*Eloge d'une dame du nom de Marguerite*⁴—repeats the substance, and often the phraseology of the *Lay de Franchise*.⁵ And as

¹ No. 447 (*Oeuvres*, III, 259). Compare, for other references to Machault, Nos. 123-4 (I, 243-6); 127 (I, 248); 306 (II, 202, ll. 298-9); 447 (III, 259); 872 (V, 53); 1416 (VIII, 52-3); 1474 (VIII, 177); and see Raynaud in *Oeuvres*, XI, 223-4.

² No. 307 (II, 203 ff.), ll. 27-65.

³ See Machault's lines (*Oeuvres*, p. 123) immediately following those quoted on p. 598, n. 1:

Li estos est plus vert que n'est verdure,
Où la fleur est entée par mesure:
Et la graine jaune est de sa nature;
Et sa racine
Toute douceur veint, et passe, et obscure.

Compare with this the *Lay de Franchise*, 33-39:

L'estoc a vert, s'a de fin or la graine;
Blanc et vermeil lui ont donné coulour.
Par l'estoc vert fermeté la demaine,
Le blanc purté chascun jour lui admaine,
Et le vermeil sui rent honte et paour;
La graine d'or monstre sa grant valour
Et comme elle est en tous temps pure et saine.

Compare, too, ll. 40 ff. of the *Lay*, with the opening lines of Machault already quoted (p. 598, n. 1).

⁴ III, 379.

⁵ See, for instance, ll. 1-10:

Tresdoulce fleur toute blanche et vermeille,
A l'estoc vert et a la graynne d'or,

Froissart in *L'Espinette* wove his own and his lady's name into an *enigme*,¹ so in the following *balade*, No. 540, Deschamps plays upon the names of Marguerite la Clivete, nonain d'Ormont, and of Eustace Morel, chastelayn de Fymes.² It is to this *religieuse*, who seems to have held a large place in his life, that, as Raynaud suggests,³ a number of other pieces where there is question of "la douce fleur" or "la fleur des fleurs," are probably addressed.⁴ Finally, another

Qui au monde n'avez pas vo pareille,
 Mais vous avez un singulier tresor ;
 Seurté par l'estoc vert
 En voz oeuvres et en voz fais appert,
 Et par la blanc Purté en vous habite,
 Par le vermeil Paour vous suit et sert ;
 Vostre nom est precieux, Marguerite
 La grayne d'or est sens, etc.

Compare, too, the last stanza with ll. 40 ff. of the *Lay*, and with the opening lines of Machault.

¹ See p. 599. In all this, one sees once more the dominant influence of Machault. See a selection from his numerous devices of this kind, in Tarbé's index, s. v. *Enigme* (pp. 167-173). Cf. P. Paris, in his edition of the *Voir Dit* (Paris, 1875), xix-xxiii.

² III, 381. See index, s. v. *La Clivete* (x, 201) and *Deschamps* (x, 183), and Raynaud in *Oeuvres*, xi, 137. There is another Marguerite poem of Deschamps—No. 1357 (vii, 146-7)—beginning with an acrostic on the name Marguerite de Saint-Dizier, in which the woman, a *religieuse* of Notre-Dame de Soissons, is called "douce flour du monde." But it is of an entirely different type from the others, being a genuine expression of grief, without any further play on the name than already indicated, for the death of his friend on May 8th, 1399. See Raynaud in xi, 85, where he associates with the poem in question Nos. 423 (iii, 227), 571 (iv, 30), and 726 (iv, 196).

³ xi, 271.

⁴ Raynaud enumerates the following: No. 431 (iii, 238): *La fleur des fleurs, c'est ma dame et m'amie*; No. 527 (iii, 362): *Tresdouce flour*; No. 528 (iii, 363): *Trespécieuse flour*; No. 532 (iii, 368): *Treshumble flour*—and especially ll. 14-16, quoted later (p. 614, n. 3); No. 538 (iii, 378): *la douce flour*; and No. 539 already described. To these may perhaps be added No. 433 (iii, 240): *humble fleur désirée*; No. 523 (iii,

group of *balades*¹ concerns itself with a lady who is twice spoken of as a flower,² and once addressed as “Marguerite, vertueuse florete”³—a group which Raynaud assures us was composed in honor of Marie of Hungary, “qu’il s’obstine avec Froissart à nommer *Marguerite*.”⁴

It is particularly important, for the later discussion, to determine the dates, so far as may be, of these poems of Deschamps; and this question may accordingly be examined here. Fortunately, for the date of the *Lay de Franchise*, the most important for our purpose, Deschamps himself gives ample and interesting evidence. In 1385, says Raynaud, at the Château de Beauté at Vincennes, “à l’occasion du 1^{er} mai, il prend thème d’une fête où l’on voit figurer le roi au milieu de dames et de jeunes seigneurs parés de *vert*, pour adresser à Charles VI son *Lai de franchise* et lui conseiller d’aviser au mal présent, la convoitise qui règne partout, et de se garder d’aimer trop la bonne chère, penchant funeste à la santé.”⁵ This date may be readily substantiated. The substance of the poem is a comparison, with the end in view which Raynaud pointed out, between two celebrations of May-day—on the one hand, by the king and his court, with all the pomp and circumstance of royalty; on the other, by

357) : Celle qui est la fleur d’umilité; No. 526 (III, 361) : La flour des flours; No. 546 (III, 389) : La flour des flours. Add, in general, Nos. 409, 411–12, 421, 440, 453, 460, 474, 498, 515, 517, 524, 543, 553, 558, 561, 574, 588, 624, 664, 714, 724, 728, 730, 747, 749–50, 761, 875, 881, 1008, 1043, 1444; lx, lxiv (Vol. x).

¹ Nos. 417 (III, 220); 463 (III, 279); 468–9 (III, 286–8).

² Nos. 417, 463.

³ No. 469, l. 5.

⁴ *Oeuvres*, xi, 47.

⁵ *Oeuvres de Deschamps*, xi, 46. The long-expected eleventh volume of Deschamps came into my hands after the chronology, for the present purpose, had been worked out. As Raynaud gives his conclusion without proof, and as the data are of considerable interest in themselves, I have thought best to include them substantially as they stood before Raynaud’s high authority was at hand.

Robin and Marion, "Sus un ruisseau buvans a un bassin"—
and the king is described as

Un Roy entr' eulx que l'en devoit amer,
Car deça mer n'avoit ne dela mer
Plus bel, plus doulz de maniere acesmée.
.XVI. ans lui pot bien Nature donner
Qui ains .XIII. ans le fist tant renommer
Qu'il desconfist en bataille ordonnée
.XXVI^m. hommes, mist a l'espée
Ou lac parfont qui se veult relever.¹

The reference is unmistakably to the victory of Charles VI at Rosebech—the battle in connection with which Froissart and the chronicler of St. Denys tell the famous story of the miraculous dispersion of the clouds, on the unfurling of the oriflamme²—since in a much later poem³ Deschamps names Charles VI :

. . . . dont furent subjuguez
A Rosebech Flament sur la montaigne ;
.XXVI^m. mourirent soubz s'enseigne,
Qui .XIII. ans n'ot quant les ala requerre.⁴

This battle was fought, to quote once more Deschamps himself :

Le jeudi jour .xx et vii. de novembre,
L'an .m.ccc. iiii^{xx}. et puis deux,
.
A Rosebech, en une haulte plaine.⁵

¹ Ll. 149–156 (II, 208).

² *Chroniques* (ed. Kervyn), 167–59 ; *Chron. de St. Denys*, I, 216 ; cf. 214.

³ No. 1124 (VI, 40 ff.), ll. 29–32. See Raynaud, in *Oeuvres*, XI, 79, for date.

⁴ He gives the number as 26,000 again in No. 94 (I, 201) ; as 20,000 in No. 19 (I, 96) ; and as 25,000 in No. 347 (III, 69). The number is given by Froissart as "xxvi [var. xxv] mille hommes et plus" (*Chroniques*, ed. Kervyn, x, 173), and in the *Chronique de St. Denys* as "vingti quinze milia" (I, 220, cf. 222–4). See more fully the notes in Deschamps, *Oeuvres*, I, 363 ; Kervyn de Lettenhove, *Chroniques*, x, 479–81.

⁵ No. 347 (III, 69), ll. 1–2, 6. This date agrees with that given still more specifically by Froissart (*Chron.*, x, 172, cf. 477). Other references to the battle of Rosebech in Deschamps are I, 94, 134 ; III, 41 ; IV, 284.

And in a statement whose minuteness of detail is worthy of Mistress Quickly, Deschamps also gives us the date of the king's birth :

En dimenche, le tiers jour de decembre,
 L'an mil .ccc. avec soixante et huit,
 Fut a Saint Pol nez dedenz une chambre
 Charles li Roys, .iiii. heures puis minuit,

 Le premier jour de l'Advent qui fut bon.¹

The king was born, then, December 3, 1368 ; the battle of Rosebech was fought November 27, 1382 ; and accordingly on May 1, 1385, Charles would be, ignoring fractions, sixteen years old—the measure of years which in the *Lay de Franchise* Deschamps says Nature might well have been able to grant him, who made him, “ains .XIII. ans,” victorious at Rosebeck.² The evidence would be conclusive, therefore,

¹ No. 55 (I, 146), ll. 1–4, 8.

² The discrepancy between Deschamps' statement of Charles' age at the time of the battle, and the fact that he actually lacked but six days of being fourteen years old, need give no pause, since Deschamps has a delightful habit of regulating the king's age by the demands of his metre. We have seen already that he has twice made him less than thirteen years of age at Rosebech. With perfect impartiality, he twice makes him fourteen on the same occasion. In the *balade* devoted to an account of the battle (No. 347) we read :

Le roy y porta s'enseingne
 A .XIII. ans, la fait qu'en sang se taingne
 Son oriflambe ;

while in the highly symbolical reference to the battle “par maniere de prophetie” in No. 1390 (VII, 244 f.), the king, under the name of Cerf Volant, is said to have put his enemies “Ains .XIII. ans a grant confusion” (ll. 4–6). In like manner Deschamps treats the king's age at his coronation. This took place November 4th, 1380, when Charles was “ou XIIe an de son eage,” as Froissart correctly gives it (ed. Kervyn, IX, 300 ; cf. XXI, 356) ; when he was “*nondum duodenis*,” according to the *Chronique de St. Denys* (I, 4). Deschamps, however, in the *Lay du Roy* (No. 311, vol. II, 314 ff.), addressing the king, says :

A .XIII. ans en Royauté,
 En bail de ton parenté
 Veu venir l'ay—

(ll. 36–8.)

that the *Lay* was written for the celebration of May-day, 1385,¹ even were its scene not laid unmistakably at the Château de Beauté-sur-Marne,² in the forest of Vincennes, where we know the king to have spent the day in question.³

But, curiously enough, this also makes fairly certain, as it happens, the identity, for this particular poem, of the "tres-douce flour" herself. On April 12, 1385, there took place at Cambray the double marriage of Marguerite de Bourgogne and Guillaume de Hainault, and of Marguerite de Hainault and Jean de Bourgogne.⁴ During the two preceding months, Marguerite de Bourgogne had been, with her mother, a frequent visitor at the Château de Beauté,⁵ and it would be

where he makes him older in November, 1380, than he had made him in November, 1382! More, nearly correct, though still a year too much, is the statement of No. 168 (I, 300) : *En .XIII^e. an vient a seignourier*" (l. 17). It may be noted that Froissart gives his age at the time of the battle correctly : "Et estoit pour lors li rois de France Charles VI^e de ce nom au quatorsisme an de son eage" (ed. Kervyn, x, 172).

¹Independently of the above, it could not have been written after July 17th, 1385, the date of the king's marriage to Isabel of Bavaria, inasmuch as the king appears in the *Lay*, with no mention of a queen, merely "Acompaigniez de son frere pareil" (l. 158). (Bellaguet, in *Chron. de St. Denys*, I, 360-1, gives the date of the king's marriage as July 18th. For correct date see Kervyn de Lettenhove in *Chroniques*, XXI, 367; cf. x, 344-52, 356-7; and Raynaud, *Oeuvres*, XI, 46.)

²Ll. 235 ff. :

De la cornant et dansant vers *Beauté*
Dehors le boys en un plaisant hosté
Tous et toutes illec s'acheminèrent ;
Marne l'ensaint par derrier a un lé, etc. (Cf. l. 182.)

The Château is described by Deschamps in *balade* No. 61 (I, 155), which affords an interesting comparison with the descriptive passages of the *Lay*.

³"Mai 1 Lundi—Mons. au bois de Vincennes *devers le roy*."—*Itinéraires de Philippe le Hardi*, ed. Ernest Petit (Paris, 1888), p. 177.

⁴Froissart, *Chroniques*, x, 311-15; *Chron. de St. Denys*, I, 352-4.

⁵See the following entries in the *Itinéraires de Philippe le Hardi* for February, 1385 : 4 Samedi—madame et mademoiselle Marguerite—gister à Beauté ; 14 Mardi—mes dites dames gister à Beauté ; 22 Mercredi—souper et gister à Beauté vers ces dames ; 26 Dimanche—Mons., madame

most natural that in a poem written during the festivities which followed her marriage and preceded her departure, a courtly compliment should be paid her by the poet. And as a matter of fact it is, as the closing lines declare, specifically to the flower that the *Lay* is dedicated, and that, too, "*au departir*:"

Et Dieux vueille celle flour remerir
Et le doulz may qui m'ont fait avertir
Par Marion et Robin seure dance.
Or lui suppli que sa douce semblance
*Reçoive en gré ce lay au departir.*¹

At all events, the date of the poem is beyond dispute, and that, as will appear, is a matter of considerable consequence.²

mons. le conte de Nevers et mademoiselle Marguerite—tout le jour à Beauté. See also for March: 5 Dimanche—Mons., madame, mons. le conte de Nevers et mademoiselle Marguerite—tout le jour à Beauté sur Marne; 12 Dimanche—madame, mons. de Nevers et mademoiselle Marguerite—tout le jour à Beauté; 16 Jeudi—madame, mademoiselle Marguerite, sa fille, tout le jour à Beauté.

¹ Ll. 308-12. Kervyn de Lettenhove in his *Froissart* (1857), I, 135-6; II, 264-5, assumed that Froissart's *balade* in the *Paradys d'Amours* was originally written on the occasion of the marriages at Cambray. The suggestion was abandoned in his later work.

² It may be said at this point that Deschamps' poems which deal with his experiences during his campaigns in Flanders are all well worth study, both for their own very great interest, and for the emphasis they place by contrast upon Chaucer's silence regarding similar experiences of his own. Deschamps reiterates the statement that he was three times—according to No. 17 (I, 94), four times—with the king on Flemish soil; see No. 781 (IV, 283 ff.); No. 19 (I, 96-7); and the note in *Oeuvres*, I, 333. With a vividness of phrase that rivals my Uncle Toby, he inveighs against his discomforts while with the army in Flanders; see, in addition to the *Rosebech balades* (p. 604, n. 5), and the *balades* just mentioned, the following: Nos. 334 (III, 41); 548 (IV, 1-3); 782 (IV, 285-6); 812 (IV, 329-30); 876 (V, 58-9); and especially the letter, No. 1403 (VII, 343-7) whose pages

. . . furent faictes, Dieu mercy,
En retournant du Dam en Flandre,
A un feu et a belle cendre,
A Artevelle et au retour,

From the data at hand, it seems impossible definitely to date the *balades* that have to do with Marguerite la Clinete; but the substantial identity in matter and phrase of the *balade*, No. 539, and the *marguerite* stanzas of the *Lay*,¹ points to dates for the two not far apart. The other group of Marguerite *balades*, at all events, which celebrate the virtues of Marie of Hungary, were written during the autumn of this same year, 1385.²

All this opens up another interesting question. It may perhaps be fairly inferred that the *Lay de Franchise*, and indeed the greater number, if not all, of Deschamps' *marguerite* poems belong to the general period of the Flower and Leaf *balades*,³ regarding which certain most suggestive conjectures have recently been offered⁴ in connection with the poems to be included among the "œuvres d'escolier" which Deschamps sent by Clifford to Chaucer.⁵ One of the Flower and Leaf *balades*, as has already been pointed out, was certainly written before the marriage of Philippa of Lancaster to the king of Portugal, February 2, 1387, and

L'an de grace Nostre Seignour
Mil .ccc. cinq et quatre vins,
Qu'en France de Flandres revins. (ll. 120-126.)

I may add from Raynaud, Nos. 16 (I, 92) and 18 (I, 95); see XI, 37-8, 47. For the understanding of certain elements of Chaucer's character and genius, few things could be more illuminating, by contrast, than the reading of such a group of poems as these.

¹ See p. 601, n. 5.

² See Raynaud, *Oeuvres de Deschamps*, XI, 47.

³ Nos. 764-7 (IV, 257-64).

⁴ By Professor Kittredge, "Chaucer and Some of his Friends," *Mod. Philology*, I (June, 1903), 1-13, esp. 5-6. See also an article by Furnivall on "'The Flower and the Leaf,' and Chaucer's 'Legend of Good Women'" in the *Athenæum*, No. 2333, July 13, 1872, pp. 49-50; and Sandras, *Étude*, 102-3, 105.

⁵ Deschamps, *Oeuvres*, II, 138 (No. 285); with translation and notes by Paget Toynbee, in *Academy*, Nov. 14, 1891, pp. 432 f.

possibly several years earlier.¹ Is it not probable that we may come still closer to the date, and infer that this *balade* was written not far from the time when there was question of a marriage between Philippa of Lancaster and Charles VI of France?² This time is easy to fix. It was between the siege of Bourbourg—where, we are told, “the kings uncles curtesly demaunded on a day of [the duke Frederyke of Bavier], if he had any doughters to mary”³—and the wedding at Cambray, when the duchess of Brabant “moved forthe this maryage of Bavyer.”⁴ For meantime, Froissart tells us, “they hadde went that duke Frederyke had forgotten the mater, for they were aboute maryages for the kynge in other places”⁵—with the daughter of the duke of Lorraine, for one—and “also ther was speakyng for the doughter of the duke of Lancastre, who was after quene of Portyngale; but there was no conclusion, bycause of the warre; therefore the mater hanged styll in suspence.” Now Bourbourg capitulated September 13, 1383;⁶ the marriages at Cambray were on April 12, 1385;⁷ the king was married July 17th, 1385, as the duchess of Brabant had promised.⁸ The negotiations regarding the marriage with Philippa would

¹ *Mod. Philol.*, I, 3-6; esp. p. 4.

² Froissart, ed. Kervyn, x, 347. Cf. Raynaud, *Oeuvres de Deschamps*, xi, 46, n. 5.

³ Froissart, ed. Kervyn, x, 346: *Etoit avenut, estant en che voiage de Berghes et de Bourbourg, que li oncle dou roy . . . ly avoient demandé moult amiablement se il n'avoit nulle fille à marier.*

⁴ *Ib.*, 347: *Or remist sus la duchoise de Braibant, quant elle fu à Cambray . . . le mariage de Bavière.*

⁵ *Ib.* . . . et quidoit bien que on eüst mis en noncalloir toutes ces choses, et ossi on parloit dou mariage dou roy ailleurs.

⁶ *Oeuvres de Deschamps*, I, 333; Froissart, ed. Kervyn, x, 265-73.

⁷ Cf. p. 606.

⁸ “Voire, dame,” respondirent li oncle dou roy, “mais nous n'en oons nulles nouvelles.”—“Or vous taissiés,” dist la duchoise, “je le feray traire avant, et en orés nouvelles en cel esté sans nulle faute.” Les promesses de la duchoise furent avéries, etc.—Froissart, x, 347.

accordingly fall during 1384—probably towards the close of the year, as some time must have elapsed in which nothing had been heard from the duke of Bavaria—or early in 1385: a period which falls in directly with the time of the composition of the *Lay de Franchise*.

Deschamps' acquaintance, moreover, with the two men most prominently mentioned in the Flower and Leaf *balades* seems also to belong to this period. Guillaume de la Trémouille¹ and Elyon de Nillac² each took part in the battle of Rosebech, and the latter seems there to have won his spurs.³ Guillaume de la Trémouille is mentioned by Deschamps only in the *balade* cited; Elyon de Nillac is named in but one other,⁴ which curiously enough celebrates an event which occurred in February, 1385—the tourney given at Saint Pol in the presence of the duchesses of Bourgogne and of Bar, in which Elyon de Nillac took part. In a word, not only is there nothing to prevent our placing the Flower and Leaf *balades* not far from the beginning of 1385, but there is positive evidence that points strongly to such a date. The Flower and Leaf *balades* and the *marguerite* poems, accordingly, seem to belong together, in point of time.

Here, then, we have a group of closely interrelated poems, written within the two decades from the middle sixties to the middle eighties, by the three recognized leaders of the new poetic movement in France,⁵ each of whom was certainly

¹ No. 765 (IV, 259).

² No. 766 (IV, 261).

³ For the former, see Kervyn de Lettenhove in Froissart, XXIII, 213; for the latter, *ib.*, XXII, 280: "Il se signala à la bataille de Roosebeke et reçut à cette occasion un don de deux mille francs."

⁴ No. 501 (III, 328); see XI, 45; Petit, *Itinéraires*, 174. From l. 12 of the *balade*, we learn that mademoiselle Marguerite also witnessed the tourney.

⁵ See G. Paris, *La Poésie du Moyen Age*, 2^e Series (Paris, 1895), 199–200, 229; cf. Gröber, *Grundriss*, II¹, 1037–66.

known to Chaucer.¹ It remains to see how far the *marguerite* poems themselves were known and used by him.²

II.

In the B-version³ of the Prologue to the *Legend*, with a felicity of phrase which even endless quotation cannot stale, Chaucer distinctly acknowledges his indebtedness to the fresh songs of certain poet-lovers, and justifies his borrowing, in a direct address to the unnamed singers, by an appeal to their common allegiance to love and to the flower:⁴

68. *But helpeth, ye that han conning and might,*
69. *Ye lovers, that can make of sentement ;*
70. *In this cas oghte ye be diligent*
71. *To forthren me somewhat in my labour,*
72. *Whether ye ben with the leef or with the flour.*
73. *For wel I wot, that ye han her-biforn*
74. *Of making ropen, and lad away the corn ;*
75. *And I come after, glening here and there,*
76. *And am ful glad if I may finde an ere*
77. *Of any goodly word that ye han left.*

¹ See, for his knowledge of Machault, the index to the Oxford *Chaucer* (vi, 387) ; Sandras, *Étude*, 75 ff., 288-294 ; ten Brink, *Studien*, 7-12, cf. 197-205 ; *Geschichte*, II, 43-46 ; Lounsbury, *Studies*, II, 212-15, cf. I, 423, III, 409. For his knowledge of Froissart, see the references in Professor Kittredge's article in *Eng. Studien*, xxvi, 321-336. For his knowledge of Deschamps, see Oxford *Chaucer*, vi, 386 (index), and I, 563, lvi-vii ; Lounsbury, *Studies*, II, 217 ; III, 14, 423 ; ten Brink, *Geschichte*, II, 199.

² It is outside the scope of the present paper to carry the history of the daisy *cultus* beyond Chaucer. See, for that, Schick's references in his edition of Lydgate's *Temple of Glas* (E. E. T. S.), p. 74, on ll. 70-74.

³ For convenience, the terms adopted by Mr. Skeat will be used in referring to the two versions: B. for the so-called *vulgata*; A. for the version of the unique ms. Gg. 4, 27. In so using the terms, however, their chronological implications are for the present waived.

⁴ It has already been pointed out by Professor Kittredge (*Mod. Philol.*, I, p. 3, n.), that this is "addressed to contemporary poets, rather than to the great of old," and that "Chaucer is not speaking of the material of his *Legend*, but of what he intends to say in the Prologue itself in praise of the Daisy."

78. And *thogh* it happen me rehercen eft
 79. That ye han in *your* fresshe songes sayd,
 80. *For-bereth* me, and beth nat evel apayd,
 81. *Sin* that ye see I do hit in the honour
 82. Of love, and eek in service of the flour,
 83. Whom that I serve as I have wit or might.¹

With this specific avowal of indebtedness in mind, let us examine, in the light of the group of French songs now defined, first the lines immediately preceding and following the passage just quoted, and then the general structure of the Prologue as a whole.

What seems to have happened, as regards the lines which lead up to Chaucer's acknowledgment of his exercise of the gleaner's right, is this. Out of the score or more poems of the French *marguerite* group, it seems clear, half a dozen have been so thoroughly assimilated, have in such fashion sung themselves—if one may phrase it so—into Chaucer's head, that the result is a veritable *cento* of quotations and allusions. I shall put side by side with Chaucer's lines the wording of certain of the "fresshe songs" themselves.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 40. Now have I than swich a con- | Cascune flour a par li son merite ; |
| dicioun, | |
| 41. That, of alle the floures in the | Mès je vous di, <i>tant que pour ma</i> |
| mede, | <i>partie,</i> |
| 42. Than love I most these floures | <i>Sus toutes flours j'aime la margherite.</i> ² |
| whyte and rede, | |

¹ Note how skilfully the passage is given a distinct unity of its own by the contrast between Chaucer's qualified "wit and might," in the closing line, and the unqualified "conning and might" ascribed to his models, in the opening line. The italicized words or lines are those peculiar to this version.

² Froissart, *Paradys d'Amours*, 1633-5; cf. 1642-4 (I, 49). For the "whyte and rede," cf. *Dittie*, 156-158 (II, 214) :

. . . me fait plaisance, pour
 A grant loisir regarder sa coulour
Blanche et vermeille, assise sur verdour.

Cf. also *ib.*, l. 17; *Paradys d'Amours*, 1639; etc.

43. Swiche as men callen daysies in
our toun. flours petites
*Que nous appellons margherites.*¹
44. To hem have I so greet affec-
cioun,
45. As I seyde erst, whan comen is
the May, *Le premier jour de ce mois de plaisance*
.
46. That in my bed ther daweth
me no day *De mon hostel me pars au point du*
jour.
Prins et sousprins d'amoureuse do-
lour,
47. That I nam up, and walking in
the mede *M'acheminay pensant par une plaine*
48. To seen this flour *A la beauté de la tresdouce flour.*²
. Car n'ai aultre desir
Que de l'avoir pour veoir à loisir
Au vespre clore et au matin ouvrir,
Et le soleil de tout le jour sievir,
*Et ses florons contre lui espanir.*³
- agein the sonne sprede,
49. Whan hit upryseth erly by the
morwe ;
50. That blisful sighte softneth al
my sorwe, *Car elle m'a gari d'oultre la mer*
De ma doulour.
51. So glad am I whan that I have
presence *Si la doy bien servir et honnourer,*

¹ *Paradys*, 1621-2 (I, 49). Froissart repeats the phrase in *La Prison Amoureuse*, 898-9 (I, 241): "une fleur petite *Que nous appellons margherite*." Chaucer's half-apologetic insistence on the name the flower bears "in our toun" seems to have in mind the necessary abandonment in English of the name on which his French contemporaries had rung so many changes—as also his justification of the English name in B. 182-5. With B. 293—"This flour, *which that I clepe the dayesye*"—compare *Paradys d'Amours*, 1672-1673 (I, 50): "De la flour où je me delitte, *Que je vous nomme margherite*."

² Deschamps, *Lay de Franchise*, ll. 14, 27-30 (II, 204). That the "tresdouce flour" is the *marguerite* is clear from the lines immediately following :

Qui en bonté, en douçour, en honour
Et en tous biens, est la flour souveraine.
L'estoc a vert, etc.

The next lines are quoted on p. 601, note 3; and accordingly the celebration of the daisy (carried on in the succeeding stanzas, to be referred to later) is directly associated with the early Mayday walk.

³ Froissart, *Dittié*, ll. 162-6 (II, 214).

52. Of hit, to doon al maner rever- *Et mettre en li cuer, et corps, et penser.*¹
ence,
53. As she, that is of alle floures flour, *Car elle est la flour souverainne*
54. Fulfilled of al vertu and honour, *De bonté et de beauté plainne,*²
55. And ever y-lyke fair, and fresh *Qui en tous temps belle et fresche sera;*³
of hewe;

¹ Machault, *Dit de la Marguerite*, p. 124. With B. 50 compare *Voir Dit* (ed. P. Paris), p. 93, l. 2193: "Vostre douçour adoucist ma dolour."

² Froissart, *Le joli mois de May*, ll. 289-90 (II, 203). It is perhaps worth noting that the title of Froissart's poem just quoted occurs in B. 176: "the joly month of May." The phrase is, however, a commonplace; cf. Froissart, *Chroniques*, XIV, 107: "A l'entrée du joly mois de May." Compare also A. 36—"the joly tyme of May"—with Gower, I, 336 (*Balade*, No. 36, l. 1): "Ce jolif temps de Maii."

³ Deschamps, No. 532, l. 16 (III, 368-9)—one of the *balades* already noted (p. 602, note 4) as closely preceding the Marguerite pair, Nos. 539-40. Chaucer's three lines, 53-55, are almost a composite of the two passages just mentioned, which are, in full, as follows:

*Car elle est la flour souverainne
De bonté et de beauté plainne,
Qui nulle bruïne n'estaint.
En tous temps est clere et certaine.*

(*Le joli mois de May*, 289-92.)

*Vostre doulçour vous fait partout amer
Et en tous lieux la flour des flours clamer
Qui en tous temps belle et fresche sera.*

(*Balade*, No. 532, ll. 14-16.)

Compare, moreover, *Le joli mois*, 289, with the two lines of the *Lay de Franchise* just quoted on p. 613, note 2; and with *Le joli mois*, 292, and *balade* No. 532, 16, compare Machault, *Dit*, pp. 128-9:

. . . c'est l'yaue douce et belle
Qui me freschit et qui me renouvelle
Et toudis est saine, clère et nouvelle.

It is important for its later bearings to note that in one of these phrases particularly, we are dealing with a commonplace. With "*la flour des flours*" of No. 532, 15, compare Froissart, *Paradys d'Amours*, 592-3 (I, 18), "j'aim *La flour sus trestoute aultre flour*;" and note that Deschamps applies the phrase "*la fleur de toutes flours*" to Machault in No. 447 (III, 259), while in No. 124 (I, 245), he calls him "*O fleur des fleurs de toute melodie*." See further, Gower's *Balades*, Nos. 4 (I, 341), 6 (343), 9 (346), and cf. Nos. 16 (351), 31 (363). Chaucer had himself used it in the *A.B.C.*, l. 4, though

56. And I love hit, and ever y-lyke newe,
Comme celle est que j'aim d'entente pure,
57. And ever shal, til that myn herte dye;
Et amerai tous jours, quoi que j'endure.¹
58. Al swere I nat, of this I wol nat lye,
S'en ce parti vivoie, nul millour Ne doit querir
59. There loved no wight hotter in his lyve.
Homs, ce m'est vis, qui tant aime et desir La flour que fai.²
60. And whan that hit is eve, I renne blyve,
Et au vespre, quant il [le soleil] fait son retour,
61. As sone as ever the sonne ginneth weste,
Ses feuilles clot que nul ne la malmaine
62. To seen this flour, how it wol go to reste,
En demonstrant qu'elle est vrai et certaine
63. For fere of night, so hateth she derknesse!
64. Hir chere is pleylny sprad in the brightnesse
Et qu'en clarté veult monstrier son atour;
65. Of the sonne, for ther hit wol uncloze.
*Mais en obscur tient si clos son demaine
 Qu'il n'est mesdis n'autre chose villaine
 Qui nul temps puist en lui faire demour.³*

it does not occur in the original of Guillaume de Deguilleville (see Oxford *Chaucer*, I, 261). In B. 185—"The emperice and flour of floures alle"—Chaucer seems to combine both "la flour souverainne" and "la flour des flours;" cf. Froissart, *Dittié*, 28-30 (II, 210), "tele flourette. . . Qui de bonté et de beauté est ditte *La souveraine*." See further, p. 629, n. 2.

¹ Froissart, *Dittié*, 81-2 (II, 212); cf. Deschamps, No. 538 (III, 378), ll. 17-18, 21-2.

² Froissart, *Dittié*, 159-62 (II, 21-2).

³ Deschamps, *Lay de Franchise*, ll. 44-50 (II, 205); cf. also B. 198-9. Chaucer, while keeping the phraseology, has reversed Deschamps' interpretation of the daisy's habit of showing its face *en clarté* and closing *en obscur*, and has taken it, more naturally, to signify fear, rather than the absence of fear. Deschamps' meaning is made perfectly clear by the corresponding passage in the Marguerite *balade*, No. 539 (III, 380), ll. 19-22:

Vous vous ouvrez quand li soleil s'esveille,
 A la clarté monstrez vostre chief sor;
 Quant il couche, vous cloez vostre oreille
 Et ne doubtez leu, penthere ne tor.

The *chief sor* ("blond doré") of the second line removes all possible doubt as to the meaning of *son atour* in the first passage, which is seen to be the

The twenty-six lines of the Prologue, accordingly, are literally "glenings here and there"—from Machault's *Dit*; from Froissart's *Paradys d'Amours*, his *Dittié*, and *Le joli mois de May*; and from Deschamps' *Lay de Franchise*, as well as, perhaps, from one of his *balades*. If we turn back, now, to Chaucer's address to the "lovers that can make of sentement,"¹ and read it—especially the lines:

And thogh it happen me rehercen eft
That ye han in your fresshe songes sayd—

in the light of the passages just quoted, it will be seen to be a specific characterization, in consummately happy phrase, of what he had just done.² For no more acceptable compliment—and this must never be lost sight of in thinking of the happy breed of men who vied with one another in sowing each the other's flowers in his several garden³—on Chaucer's

direct equivalent of "hir chere" in the Prologue. It should be noted that the idea of the daisy's fear of darkness is given, by implication, in Froissart's *Dittié*, where the flower is said to follow the sun:

Car le soleil, qui en beauté l'afine,
Naturellement li est chambre et courtine,
Et le deffent contre toute bruïne. ll. 58-60 (II, 211).

¹ It is worth noting that in the *Paradys d'Amours* Froissart, referring to the *balade* of the *marguerite* itself, says:

Oïl, dame, *de sentement*
Et de coer amoureux et sade
Ai ordonné une balade. (ll. 1604-6.)

² Note, too, that the lines immediately preceding (B. 66-7) are:

Allas! that I ne had *English*, ryme or prose,
Suffisant this flour to preyse aright!

³ The "colours of rethoryk" are not mine, but Deschamps' own. In Chaucer's garden, he protested, he should be but a nettle—"En ton jardin ne seroye qu'ortie"—but he obviously was willing to be transplanted, none the less. If the Prologue *did* form the answer to Deschamps' "de rescripre te prie"—and all this goes to strengthen one's feeling that such may have been the case—the exquisite courtesy of the reference to the gleanings in Deschamps' and Froissart's fields is manifest.

part could have been paid Deschamps and Froissart, than that of taking up their goodly words into what one of them once called his "douce mélodie"; and nothing could be more apt, nothing more courtly, than his heightening of the compliment by graceful acknowledgment of what he had, as one now sees, gleaned after their master Machault and themselves.¹

¹There is but one phrase in the corresponding lines of the A-version—whose relation to B. will be considered later—on which the French poems seem to throw additional light. This is A. 58—"As wel in winter as in somer newe"—which corresponds to B. 56—"And I love hit, and ever y-lyke newe." The parallels for the idea of A. are abundant, as for instance the following :

*Car en janvier,
Que toutes flours sont mortes pour l'yvier,
Celle perçut blancir et vermillier, etc.*

(Froissart, *Dittié*, ll. 96-8 ; cf. ll. 42-4.)

or the following lines :

*Car en tous temps, plueve, gresille ou gelle,
Soit la saisons ou fresque, ou laide, ou nette,
Ceste flour est gracieuse et nouvelle.*

(Froissart, *Paradys d' Amours*, 1636-8.)

Compare also *Pastourelle*, No. xvii, 44-50 (II, 345) :

*Quant la violette est fanée
Et roses dont on fait chapeaus,
Et il vient froit temps et gelée,
Lors ai tantos une esculée
De margherites, sans mentir,
Se jusqu' aux champs je voeil courir ;
J'en trouve en chemins et en fretes, etc.*

Almost Chaucer's exact phrase occurs in one of the later poems of Froissart (see p. 600, n. 6), the *Plaidoirie de la Rose et de la Violette*, ll. 333-336 (II, 245) :

*Encore a il les margerites
Qui sont flours belles et petites,
Dont il est très bon recouvier,
En tous temps, l'esté et l'yvier.*

The claims of the poets are entirely within the facts, for England and the continent alike. For statements to the effect that the daisy blooms all the year, see, among others, Hooker, *Students' Flora of the British Islands*

But the lines which in B. immediately follow his acknowledgment of the furtherance he has thus received, are of even greater interest, as placing in striking juxtaposition *both* the great influences—French and Italian—which had hitherto been dominant in his work. For so far as I know, it has never been pointed out that the beautiful passage, found in B. alone, in which the flower is apostrophized as “the clernesse and the verray light,” is taken almost bodily from the opening stanzas of the *Filostrato*—the stanzas which

(London, 1884), 205; Ellacombe, *Plant-lore of Shakespeare* (London, 1884), p. 376, in the essay on the Daisy, which gathers together a great number of references to it in the English poets; de Lamarck et de Candolle: *Flore française* (Paris, 1815), III, 185; and finally the statement in Schlechtendal, Langenthal u. Schenck, *Flora von Deutschland* (Gera-Untermhaus, 1887), XXIX, 109; “Fast das ganze Jahr hindurch, selbst unter dem Schnee fortblühend.” One recalls, of course, Wordsworth’s *To a Daisy*:

Thee Winter in the garland wears
That thinly decks his few gray hairs. . . .
Whole Summer-fields are thine by right; etc.
(*Globe* ed., 1888, p. 184.)

The phrase has, however, *symbolic* associations, which are perhaps best seen in an interesting passage of the *Voir Dit*. Machault is telling

Comment li ancien entailloient
L’image d’Amour, ou paignoient,

and enumerates three inscriptions surrounding the figure of the God of Love—“De près et de loing;” “A mort et à vie;” and “*Et en yver et en esté.*” The latter, it is explained,

. . . . enseigne et devise
Qu’ à parfaite amour rien ne chaut,
D’iver, d’esté, de froit, de chaut;
Ne elle ne se varie point,
Ainsois est toudis en un point,
Ferme, loial, viste et ounie.

(*Voir Dit*, ed. P. Paris, pp. 297–9.)

Some such implication undoubtedly carries over to the poets’ statements of the well-known persistence into winter of the flower. See also p. 630, n. 2.

Chaucer, for reasons of his own, had rejected in writing the *Troilus*. The lines are as follows :

- | | |
|--|--|
| 84. She is the clernesne and the verray
light, | <i>Tu donna se' la luce chiara e bella,</i> |
| 85. That in this derke worlde me
wynt and ledeth, | <i>Per cui nel tenebroso mondo accorto</i>

<i>Vivo ; tu se' la tramontana stella</i>
<i>La qual io seguio per venire al porto.¹</i>
<i>Tu se' nel tristo petto effigiata</i> |
| 86. The herte in-with my sorowful
brest yow dredeth, | |
| 87. And loveth so sore that ye ben
verrayly | |
| 88. The maistresse of my wit and
nothing I. | <i>Con forza tal, che tu vi puoi più ch'io ;</i> |
| 89. My word, my werk, is knit so in
your bonde, | |
| 90. That, as an harpe obeyeth to the
honde | |
| 91. And maketh hit sounne after his
fingeringe, | |
| 92. Right so mowe ye out of myn
herte bringe | <i>Pingine fuor la voce sconsolata</i> |
| 93. Swich vois, right as yow list, to
laughe or pleyne. | <i>In guisa tal, che mostri il dolor mio</i>

<i>Nell' altrui doglie, e rendila sì grata,</i>
<i>Che chi l'ascolta ne divenga pio ;²</i>
<i>Guida la nostra man, reggi l'ingegno,</i> |
| 94. Be ye my gyde and lady sove-
reynne ; | <i>Nell' opera la quale a scriver vegno.³</i>
<i>Tu mi se' Giove, tu mi sei Apollo,</i> |
| 95. As to myn erthly god, to yow I
calle, | |
| 96. Bothe in this werke and in my
sorwes alle. | <i>Tu se' mia musa, io l'ho provato e
sollo.⁴</i> |

¹ *Opere volgari di Giovanni Boccaccio* (Firenze, per Ig. Moutier, 1831), vol. XIII, p. 12 (*Il Filostrato*, Pt. I, stanza II, ll. 1-4).

² *Ib.* p. 13, stanza v, ll. 1-6. It is interesting to notice that Chaucer, having begun, under the influence of his context, in the third person—"She is the clernesne," etc.—passes almost immediately into the second person of the Italian on which he has his eye.

³ *Ib.* p. 12, stanza IV, ll. 7-8.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 12, stanza II, ll. 7-8. It will be noted that all the lines from the *Filostrato* occur within the limits of three stanzas—the 2d, 4th, and 5th.

But Chaucer's mind—and the fact shows strikingly what hold the French songs, for the time, had taken of his fancy—is still so saturated with the phraseology of the *marguerite* poems that even his adaptation of Boccaccio's lines is permeated by their influence. The "dredeth and loveth" of ll. 86–7, which has modified the figure of Boccaccio, and is repeated in "this flour that I so love and drede" of B. 211, recalls at once Machault's lines :

Si appartient
Que je la serve et aime, et doute, et croie,
Et que mes cuers à autre ne s'ottroye,
Que l'aime et orient.¹

The substitution of the more general phrase "erthly god" for the specific names Jove and Apollo, may well have been suggested by Deschamps' line—*Car des fleurs est la déesse*

¹ *Dit de la Marguerite*, pp. 126–7. It is of importance to the later discussion to make entirely clear the fact that the phrases here in question are among the commonplaces of such poems as we are considering. For that reason the lists subjoined are longer than may at this point seem necessary. With the passage just cited, compare the following from Machault's *Voir Dit*: car je vous *ameray* et obéiray, *doubteray*, serviray tant com je vivray (ed. P. Paris, p. 21); Et je qui *l'amay* et *doubtay* (p. 297); . . . ma dame de pris, Que *j'aim*, *criem*, *sers*, et loe et pris (p. 307). See also Froissart, *Le joli Buisson*, 2718–19 (II, 81): Il m'a loyamment servi, *Doubté*, *cremu*, obey; *Lays Amoureux*, No. 6 (II, 280), ll. 125–9: *S'amerai*, *Servirai*, *Cremerai* Et à li obeirai; *Le joli mois de May*, 80–81 (II, 196): La plus très parfaite en honneur *Sers*, *crienc* et *ains*. Add Deschamps, x, xlvii: dame, que *j'aim*, honnour et *craing*; x, liv: Car je dy, quant je l'aour, *Aim* et desir, *sers* et *craing* et honnour; etc. To "drede" as well as love one's lady, was a duty. See, for instance, Machault, *Oeuvres* (ed. Tarbé), p. 37:

Lors me dist qu'il n'est nulz vivans
Qui soit amis s'il n'est doutans:
Car on doit sa dame doubter.

Cf. *ib.*, p. 39:

Pour ce en *doutance* et en *cremour*
Veil ma douce Dame obéir.

*mondaine*¹—in the *Lay de Franchise*, from which we have already had evidence of borrowing. Nor must one forget in this connection that Deschamps had called Chaucer himself the “earthly god” of Love in Albion!² The phrase “lady sovereyne”—which occurs again in B. 275—is one of the most frequent of commonplaces in the contemporary French love-poems.³ As for the simile of the harp, one cannot help thinking, to judge from the tone of the fragment accessible,⁴ that if one could see Machault’s *Dit de la Harpe*, made in honor of Agnes of Navarre, it might reveal the suggestion

¹ *Lay de Franchise*, l. 52 (II, 205). The same phrase occurs again in *balade* No. 414 (III, 216), where the lady is also called *dame souverayne*.

² “Tu es d’amours *mondains Dieux* en Albie” (No. 285, II, 139). Conclusive against Toynbee’s “god of worldly love” (see p. 608, n. 5) is the reference to Machault as “*mondains dieux d’armonie*” (No. 124, I, 245). Compare Machault himself in the *Voir Dit*: Si vous jur et promet que, à mon pooir, je vous serviray loyalment et diligemment . . . comme Lancelos ne Tristans servient onques leurs dames; et aourray comme *Dieu terrien* et comme la plus precieuse et glorieuse relique que je véysse onques en lieu où je fusse (ed. P. Paris, p. 68; also *Oeuvres*, ed. Tarbé, p. 140). Compare also *Voir Dit*, p. 101, ll. 2415–16; Deschamps, iv, pp. 113, 124, 217. With the use of the word *relique* above, cf. B. 321.

³ See, for instance, Deschamps, III, 257 (No. 445), l. 13—where the lady is also called “mon bien mondain,” and “ma deesse ou j’ay ferme creance”; III, 286 (No. 468)—where the lady is also called “la tresmontaine”; III, 318 (No. 493); III, 342 (No. 511); III, 358 (No. 524),—where the lady is also called “tresdoulces flour”; X, li (No. XLIV); Froissart, ed. Scheler, I, 167, l. 2724; 121, l. 1199; II, 17, l. 571; Machault, *Voir Dit*, pp. 18–21, 41–42, 52, 54–5, 60–61, 67–9; *Oeuvres* (ed. Tarbé), p. 169; Gower (ed. Macaulay), *Balades*, Nos. 14 (I, 349), 39 (I, 368); etc., etc. The number of references may be multiplied indefinitely.

⁴ The first 47 lines are printed in Bartsch, *Chrestomathie de l’ancien français* (Leipzig, 1901, 7th ed.), p. 411; see also Snell, *The Fourteenth Century* (N. Y., 1899), p. 166; Tarbé in *Oeuvres*, xxi, 169. See, for instance, such lines as the following:

Si que je puis legierement prouver
qu’on ne porroit pas instrument trouver
de si plaisant ne de si cointe touche,
quant blanche main de belle et bonne y touche,
ne qu’en douceur a elle se compere. (ll. 25–9.)

for the figure¹—if, indeed, it be necessary to assume a foreign source at all.

The body of the passage, however, is clearly borrowed from the *Filostrato*. Is it possible, now, to see why Chaucer should have used here the lines he had passed over in the *Troilus*? In the first place, their rejection as unfit material for his introduction to the *Troilus* is easy to understand. Chaucer's avowed attitude towards his subject was that of an outsider in affairs of love :

For I that god of Loves servaunts serve,
Ne dar to Love, for myn unlyklynesse,
Preyen for speed, al sholde I therfor sterve,
*So fer am I fro his help in derknesse.*²

Though he speak of love unfeelingly :

No wonder is, for it no-thing of newe is ;
*A blind man can nat juggen wel in hevis.*³

He is only the *clerk* of those who serve the goddess of love,⁴ and would have it distinctly understood

That of no sentement I this endyte,
 But out of Latin in my tonge it wryte.⁵

The introduction to the *Filostrato*, on the other hand, was intensely personal. It will be remembered that in the first stanza, Boccaccio, after declaring that some are accustomed to invoke Jove, others Apollo, as he himself had been wont to call upon the Muses, asserts that love has recently led

¹ It will be remembered that Chaucer twice uses the harp in similes in the *Troilus*, in both instances where he is not following Boccaccio—once (T., I, 729–35) where the suggestion is from Boethius ; and again in T., II, 1030–36. See *Anglia*, v, 358.

² T., I, 15–18.

³ T., II, 20–21.

⁴ T., III, 40–41.

⁵ T., II, 13–14. Compare “Ye lovers, that *can* make of sentement,” B. 69.

him to an innovation.¹ It is his lady—who, in the lines already quoted,² he declares to be his light, his lodestar—it is *she* who shall be his Jove, his Apollo, his Muse. It is to console himself, he goes on, for her absence from the city—an absence on which he dwells at length in his prose *Proemio*, with a vivid application to himself of the restlessness he later ascribes to Troilus³—that he writes the story of the sad life of Troilus after Griseida had gone away from Troy.⁴ And so, in the fourth stanza, he invokes Fiametta, as we have seen, to guide him in the work he is about to write—an invocation continued in the six lines already quoted from the fifth stanza; and it is only in the last couplet of this same stanza that we finally reach a line which Chaucer had already used in the *Troilus*:

*Tuo sia l'onore, e mio si sia l'affano,*⁵
Se i detti alcuna laude acquisteranno.

¹ Alcun di Giove sogliono il favore
Ne' lor principii pietosi invocare ;
Altri d' Apollo chiamano il valore ;
Io di Parnaso le muse pregare
Solea ne' miei bisogni, ma amore
Novellamente m'ha fatto mutare
Il mio costume antico e usitato,
Poi fu' di te, madonna, innamorata. (*Opere*, XIII, p. 11).

²In two sections on p. 619—see notes 1 and 4—between which come the lines :

Ancora di salute tu se' quella
Che se' tutto il mio bene e 'l mio conforto ; (*Opere*, XIII, p. 12).

³In the stanzas which Chaucer has translated and amplified in *Troilus*, Bk. V, 519–679.

⁴ Per che volendo per la tua partita,
Più greve a me che morte e più noiosa,
Scriver qual fosse la dolente vita
Di Troilo, da poi che l'amorosa
Griseida da Troia sen fu gita, etc. (*Opere*, XIII, p. 12.)

See especially Boccaccio's *Proemio* to the *Filostrato* (*Opere*, XIII, pp. 1–10).

⁵Have he my thank, and myn be this travayle ! (*Troilus*, I, 21.)

It is perfectly clear, then, that, for the *Troilus*, either Chaucer's consistent attitude of one who "knowe[th] not love in dede,"¹ or Boccaccio's opening stanzas would have to go by the board; and it was the stanzas, of course, which went.

But why should he use them here?² There seems to be a very natural association of ideas to account for it. It happens that there is, near the close of Machault's *Dit de la Marguerite*, a stanza whose opening lines very strikingly recall the second stanza of the *Filostrato*:

C'est li solaus qui esclaire et qui luist;
C'est la lune qui fait la clerè nuit;
C'est l'estoile qui par mer me conduist;
C'est la naselle
Forte, seure et plainne de déduit;
C'est li patrons qui me gouverne et duit.³

¹ *Parl. Foules*, 8.

² Among other things, it is a delightful instance of Chaucer's economy of his material—"die ökonomie, welche ihm in der verwaltung seines geistiges erwerbes eigen ist," as Koeppl phrases it. (*Anglia*, N. F., I, 175.) Compare his use of the stanzas from the *Teseide* in the *Troilus* and the *Parlement of Foules*, etc.

³ *Dit de la Marguerite*, p. 128. This is again one of the commonplaces of the poetry of the type under discussion. Compare the passage in Machault's *Voir Dit* (ed. P. Paris, Paris, 1875), p. 5, beginning:

C'est l'escharboucle qui reluist
Et esclarcist l'obscure nuit;
C'est en or li fins dyamans
Qui donne grace à tous aimans;
.
C'est droitement la tresmontaine
Qui cuers au port de joie maine. (ll. 95-8, 101-2.)

See, too, Deschamps' *Lay de Departement* (No. 313, II, 335 ff.), ll. 25 ff.—

C'est l'estoille trasmontaine,
Aurora la desirée, etc.—

and the passage beginning with l. 227:

C'est ma tour et ma fortesse, etc.

Compare Deschamps, No. 740 (IV, 217), ll. 9-17.

Need it be far wide of the mark to conjecture that these lines, applying as they did to the *marguerite*, may have recalled to Chaucer the well-known stanzas before weighed and for his earlier purpose found wanting, but in the main

The commonplace seems to represent—and the fact is of interest in its bearing on the evolution of conventions—a transfer to an earthly lady and the “love of kinde,” of the expressions commonly used of “love celestial” in the hymns to the Virgin—notably the “Ave maris stella” in the Office of the Virgin. See in Deschamps himself No. 363 (III, 104) :

Marie as nom, estoille tresmontaine ;

and especially the invocation to Mary at the close of his translation of the treatise of Pope Innocent :

Prions ent la souverainne
Vierge, estoille tresmontainne
La mere d'umilité
Que par sa douce pité
Au port de salut nous mainne.

(No. 309^b, II, 304, § xxxviii.)

But he had said the same of Marie of Hungary !

Aux desvoiez estes la tresmontaine
Vo doulx parler leur rent si tresdoulx son
Qu'au port d'onneur les radresce et ramaine.

(No. 468, III, 286-7 ; cf. XI, 47.)

Compare the address to the Virgin at the close of Gower's *Miroir de l'Omme* (ed. Macaulay, I, 333-4) :

O de la mer estoille pure,
O cliere lune esluminouse,
.

O gemme, O fine Margarine, etc. (ll. 29925-6, 29937.)

So *Dits et Contes Baudouin de Condé* (ed. Scheler), I, xxiii :

Sainte Marie, douce mere,
Qui es de mer estoille clere,
Et dou ciel beneoite porte (*Dis de Nostre-Dame*).

See also *The Minor Poems of the Vernon MS.* (E. E. T. S.), Pt. I, 134, 136, etc. ; Pt. II, 735-6, etc. Compare in general what Dr. Neilson says (*Court of Love*, 220 ff.) of the transfer to the shrine of Venus of the modes of adoration of the Virgin ; and see W. A. R. Kerr on *Souverain*, in *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XIX, 33. For a description of the real “Tresmontaine,” see the *Voir Dit*, p. 256.

so perfectly adapted to his present plan?¹ Accordingly he uses them, "*tenebroso mondo*," "*tristo petto*," "*il dolor mio*," and all, without allowing in the least the fact to disconcert him that every one of these phrases was in flat contradiction to the blithe May-day mood of the lines he had just written—as well as of those he was about to write.²

The greater part of the indebtedness of the Prologue to the French daisy poems—with two large exceptions, to be considered by themselves—is incurred in the lines thus far

¹ At all events, it was precisely this similarity between the lines of Machault and the *Filostrato* stanza, that suggested to the present writer the lines of Boccaccio as Chaucer's source; and the fact that the one did, in this instance—if one may be allowed *sic parvis componere magna*—actually so recall the other, is so far forth good evidence for what might in the first place have occurred, particularly in the case of one who knew both poems intimately. Nor may it perhaps be considering too curiously to see a second possible association. The acknowledgment, in the Prologue, of Chaucer's indebtedness, begins with an appeal to lovers for help:

But helpeth, ye that han conning and might,
Ye lovers, that can make of sentement (B. 68-9).

The sixth stanza of the *Filostrato*, immediately following the passage we have seen Chaucer proceeds to use, begins similarly with an appeal to lovers:

E voi amanti prego che ascoltiat
Ciò che dirà 'l mio verso lagrimoso;
E se nel cuore avvien che voi sentiate
Destarsi alcuno spirito pietoso,
Per me vi prego ch'amore preghiate (Opere XIII, p. 13);

and these lines Chaucer did use in his *Troilus*:

But ye loveres, that bathen in gladnesse,
If any drope of pitee in you be,
. . . eek for me preyeth to god so dere (*Troilus* I, 22-3, 32).

To a man whose own phrases clung to his mind as Chaucer's certainly did, the flash of the memory from "Ye lovers that can make of sentement," to the earlier "Ye loveres that bathen in gladnesse," would be most natural, and would carry with it the recollection of the stanzas previously rejected, but now so apt.

² For "my sorwes alle" turn out to be not Chaucer's, but Boccaccio's! Whose was the "siknesse" of the Proem to the *Book of the Duchesse*?

discussed.¹ But before leaving this phase of the subject, it will be well to note two passages which still remain. One of them is of peculiar interest for the hint it gives of the relative part played by convention, as contrasted with actual observation, even in Chaucer's marvellously convincing lines. After the beautiful passage in which he describes his greeting to the flower,

Kneling alway, til hit unclosed was,
Upon the smale softe swote gras,²

he goes on to tell how the grass was

. . . with floures swote embrouded al,
Of swich swetnesse and swich odour over-al,
That, for to speke of gomme, or herbe, or tree,
Comparisoun may noon y-maked be ;
For hit surmounteth pleyntly alle odoures,
And eek of riche beautee alle floures.³

The reference is again unmistakably to the daisy, which—as it is properly characterized in the well-known song that opens the *Two Noble Kinsmen*, and happens to use odor as the distinguishing quality of the flowers it names—is “smell-less,”⁴ so that Chaucer is apparently guilty of a surprising blunder. Contrary to the facts his statement certainly is,⁵

¹ Professor Kittredge has already pointed out (*Eng. Stud.*, xxvi, 336, n. 1) the striking resemblance between *Leg.* 1-8 and Froissart's *Le Joli Buisson*, 786-92 (II, 24.)

² B. 117-18.

³ B. 119-24; cf. *The Court of Love*, ll. 801-2.

⁴ Roses, their sharp spines being gone,
 Not royal in their smells alone,
 But in their hue;
 Maiden pinks, of odour faint,
 Daisies smell-less, yet most quaint,
 And sweet thyme true.

(*Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*, ed. Dyce (London, 1846), xi, 331.)

⁵ If one hesitate to trust the testimony of one poet against another, or even the evidence of one's proper nose, one may find impartial and scientific

but the thing to be remembered is that at this point he was composing with his eye upon Machault rather than upon the object! To Machault, however, odor had to be an attribute of the *marguerite* for very much the same reason that to Anselm existence had to be predicated of the deity. For since the lady must be perfect and entire, wanting nothing in all the qualities of a lady, her flower must *ipso facto* be possessed of all the perfections of a flower,¹ and so it follows that it

Par excellence est garnie d'odour.²

authority on the point from Ruel: In sativis plerique et punicei et versicolores flosculi spectant, *sed omnes sine odore* (*De Natura Stirpium*, 1543, p. 441); through Dalechamps et Moulin: ses fleurs . . . *ne sentient rien* (*Histoire générale des Plantes*, Lyon, 1653, I, 742); down to Sowerby: Flowers various in size, *inodorous* (*English Botany*, London, 1797, VI, 424); and von Strautz: . . . das kleine *duftlose* Ding (*Die Blume in Sage und Geschichte*, Berlin, 1875, p. 225). Compare *Cornhill Magazine*, Jan., 1878, p. 64. Godwin pointed out the lack of odor as one of the defects "supplied by the wantonness of the poet's fancy" (*Life of Chaucer*, ed. 1803, II, 349).

¹ See, for the principle, a superb parallel in Neckam, *De Laudibus Divinæ Sapientię*, v, 931-48. The feeling is closely related to that involved in the rise of flower nomenclature itself for women, as Langlois gives it: Au moyen âge surtout . . . on n'aurait pas compris qu'une belle femme eût un nom disgracieux. Le trouvère, qui, avec une certaine naïveté, prétendait toujours que celle dont il célébrait les mérites fût la plus belle et la plus aimable 'qui onques de mère fust née,' lui cherchait un nom digne d'elle, un nom qui flattât l'oreille par la douceur de sa prononciation et l'imagination par l'idée qu'il évoquait d'un objet ou d'une qualité aimables. Certains noms de fleurs . . . réunissaient cette double qualité, &c.—*Origines et Sources du Roman de la Rose* (Paris, 1891), 38-9. See the whole interesting passage.

² *Dit de la marguerite*, p. 123. Cf. further: Dès que mon œil la vit premièrement Et je senti *son odour* doucement (p. 125); and also: *Sa douce odeur* qui de loing m'est présente (p. 125); et *qui la sent* (p. 125); etc. Skeat (*Oxford Chaucer*, III, xxxi) has pointed out a parallel between B. 53-55 (though B. 123-4 is much closer) and the lines immediately preceding that cited in the text from Machault:

Toutes passe, ce m'est vis, en colour ;
Et toutes ha surmonté de douçour.

Ne comparer
Ne se porroit nulle à li de colour.

But just this treatment of the flower illustrates vividly another thing—the fact that throughout its relatively short-lived *cultus*, the *marguerite* fell in large measure heir to the possessions of the Rose.¹ From the wealth of conventions there ready at hand, phrase after phrase was transferred bodily to the new “flour of flours,”² and the present instance is a case in point. For what Machault, followed by the others, says of the odor of the *marguerite*, is but a stock commonplace carried over—with no thought of the actual flower to which it was to be attached—from the allegory of the Rose. The *Dit de la Rose*, for instance, ends as follows :

Ci fenist le ditie d'amor
 Qui a le seurnon de la flor
 Qui plus bele est sus toutes choses.
 Bien en a l'en atret les gloses,
Et par couleur et par odeur
*Vaut ele miex que nule fleur.*³

¹ Compare with this the interesting transfer to an earthly mistress (already noted, p. 625) of the conventions hitherto attaching to the Virgin.

² The phrases themselves, “la flour des flours,” “la flour sus trestoute aultre flour,” etc. (see p. 614, n. 3), are cases of such inheritance. See, for instance, *La Patenostre d'Amours* (Barbazan, *Fabliaux et Contes*, Paris, 1808, iv, 442) :

Voluntas tua. S'est enclose
 M'amor en vous : comme la rose
 Est *sor toutes flors* la plus bele,
 Ausi estes-vous, Damoisele,
 De toutes puceles la flor, etc. (ll. 37–41.)

So also *Li Contes de la Rose*, in *Dits et Contes de Baudouin de Condé* (ed. Scheler, Brussels, 1866), i, 145 : Rose est *sor toutes flors* la fine. Compare the line from the *Carmen de Rosa* quoted in Langlois, *Origines et Sources du Roman de la Rose* (Paris, 1891), p. 45 :

Vidi florem floridum, vidi *florum florem*

(*Carmina Burana*, Stuttgart, 1847, No. 50, p. 141) ; and the “Vale, *flos florum !*” of *ib.*, No. 57, p. 145 ; cf. No. cxlviii, p. 53. One recalls, too :

Ut rosa *flos florum*
 Sic Arthurus rex regum.

³ Bartsch, *Le lang. et la litt. françaises* (1887), 610 ; see also Langlois, *op. cit.*, 44.

Parallels might be multiplied indefinitely,¹ but the case is clear.²

When we turn, now, from Machault to his successors, we find that Froissart, in other respects much more realistic in his treatment, follows suit :

Zepherus li donna odours.³

Deschamps, in the Marguerite *balade*⁴ admits the possibility—

Voir de tel fleur a maint l'odeur prouffite—

but enters mild protest in the *Lay de Franchise*:⁵

. . . flour n'est qu'a lui s'affiere,
Car s'odeur n'est orgueilleuse ne fiere (!),
Ne ne sçaroit nul homme decevoir.

Chaucer's acceptance of the convention, then, in the face of the patent facts, is not only of peculiar interest here, but is instructive, no less, as once more showing the large allowance that must constantly be made for the presence of poetic commonplace in dealing with what in his poems seem to be plain statements of fact. To do otherwise is to commit the tempting anachronism of measuring him once for all by the standards of the Preface to the *Lyrical Ballads*, instead of recognizing "ever y-lyke newe" the consummate art

¹ For example, Baudouin de Condé, *op. cit.*, I, 146; *Voir Dit*, II. 992-4.

² A corresponding transfer is possibly seen in the "winter and summer" phrases already discussed on p. 617, n. 1. Compare the following passages quoted in Langlois, *op. cit.*, 34 :

Qu'il i avoit tous jours plenté
De flors, *et yver et esté* (*R. R.*, 1409-10) ;
Fuelles et flors ont tos tans li ramier . . .
Ja *par ivier* n'aront nul destorbier.

(*Fabel dou dieu d'Amours*, p. p. A Jubinal, Paris, 1834, p. 15.)

In this case, however, it is more likely that we have a genuine observation of the actual persistence into winter of the flower.

³ *Pastourelle*, XVII, 66 (II, 345).

⁴ No. 539, l. 16 (III, 380). ⁵ LL. 645 (II, 205).

involved in his treatment of the artistic conventions of his own time.

The remaining passage has an interest of another sort. In B. 215–20, the crown worn by the queen whom he later finds to be Alceste is thus described :

A fret of gold she hadde next hir heer,
And upon that a whyt coroun she beer
With *florouns*¹ smale, and I shal nat lye ;
For al the world, ryght as a dayesye
Y-corouned is with whyte leves lyte,
So were the *florouns*¹ of hir coroun whyte.

Now the word *floroun* is very rare in Middle English. Mätzner² and Stratmann³ give only the present examples of it, while the *New English Dictionary*⁴ cites no other until c. 1660. Mätzner defines it as “Blumenwerk” ; Stratmann as “flower-ornament” ; the *New English Dictionary* as “A flower-shaped ornament, used *esp.* in architecture or printing, on coins, etc.” The word occurs in Old French, where it has the meaning assigned to the English word in the dictionaries just cited,⁵ and is specifically used of the ornaments of a crown.⁶ It is also used as the equivalent of *fleurette*, certainly at a period somewhat later than the one we are concerned

¹ The reading is that of the Fairfax and Tanner MSS. The Trinity College and Arch. Seld. MSS. read *floures* (*flouris*). See *A Parallel-Text Edition of Chaucer's Minor Poems* (Chaucer Soc.), p. 257. On the superior value of the Fairfax and Tanner MSS. as authorities for the text, see Bilderbeck, *Chaucer's Legend of Good Women* (London, 1902), p. 49 ; Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, III, 1–li, cf. xlviii ; cf. *Globe Chaucer*, xlv.

² *Altenglische Sprachproben, Wörterbuch* (Berlin, 1885), II, 143, s. v. *flouroun*.

³ *Middle-Eng. Dic.*, ed. Bradley (Oxford, 1891), 230, s. v. *flouroun*.

⁴ s. v. *fleuron*.

⁵ “Ornement en forme de fleur,” Godefroy, IX, 629.

⁶ “Une couronne d'or a douze *florons*” (21 août, 1384, *Test. chirog.*, A. Douai) ; “Nostre bonne couronne a esté desmenbree et les *flourons* d'icelle bailles en gaijes” (25 mai, 1413, *Ord.*, x, 92)—both cited by Godefroy. See the examples in Littré, II, 1700, s. v. *fleuron* 1°, Hist. XIV^e s.

with,¹ probably in the 14th century.² But it also has, if I mistake not, a meaning in Old French which neither Godefroy nor Sainte-Palaye assign to it—although it clearly appears in one of the examples Godefroy cites³—that of a *petal* of a flower, or, to put it more accurately for such composite blossoms as the daisy, “chacune des petites fleurs dont la réunion forme une fleur composée.”⁴ With that meaning, the word occurs twice in Froissart’s *Dittie*—once in a passage already cited, as parallel with B. 48 :

Et ses *florons* contre lui espanir ;⁵

and again in the last stanza :

Car en *cascun floron*, je vous creant,
Porte la *flour* un droit dart à taillant,
Dont navrés sui si, en soi regardant,
Que membre n’ai où le cop ne s’espanit.⁶

The reference to the “*droit dart a taillant*” which the “*flour*” carries in each “*floron*,” puts the meaning of *floron* here beyond doubt, for it is an exact account, despite the fanciful turn of the close, of what one sees on pulling out one of the white rays of the daisy.⁷ If one look, now, at the description of Alceste’s

¹ Ste Palaye, VI, 235–6, s. v. *fleuron* ; Godefroy, IV, 32, s. v. *fleuron* ; Littré, II, 1700, s. v. *fleuron* 5°.

² The dictionaries give no example, unless one include the passage from Watrquet de Couvin, ed. Scheler, p. 101, cited in Ste Palaye, VI, 239, s. v. *florin* 3.

³ IX, 629 : “Un grant dragouer, fait dessus et par le pié en maniere d’une rose, et es *florons d’icelle rose* a esmaux a plusieurs bestelettes” (*Invent. du duc d’Anjou*, n° 639).

⁴ Littré, II, 1700, 4°. Cf. Rousseau, *Lettres élémentaires sur la Botanique*, Lettre VI, *Oeuvres* (Paris, 1891), VI, 48–49.

⁵ l. 166 (II, 214).

⁶ Ll. 187–190 (II, 215).

⁷ See, in Rousseau’s delightful paragraph on the daisy in the sixth of the *Lettres élémentaires* already referred to, the following : Arrachez une des *folioles blanches de la couronne*, vous croirez d’abord cette foliole plate d’un bout à l’autre ; mais regardez-la bien par le bout qui étoit attaché à le fleur,

crown in the Prologue, it will be clear at a glance that Chaucer is using the word "floroun" in precisely Froissart's sense—that of one of the "whyte leves lyte" of the daisy—and not in the sense of an individual daisy at all.¹ Considering the rarity of the word in any sense in Middle English, and in just this sense in Old French, the conclusion that Chaucer took it from Froissart is almost inevitable; and inasmuch as the A-version has in both instances *floures*

vous verrez que ce bout n'est pas plat, mais rond et creux en forme de tube, et que de ce tube sort un petit filet à deux cornes: ce filet est le style fourchu de cette fleur," etc.; cf. Ellacombe, *op. cit.*, 374. See also, in the absence of the flower itself (remembering that our so-called American daisy is not Chaucer's daisy—*Bellis perennis*—at all), such figures of the *floron* with its little "dart" as those in Baillon, *Dict. de Botanique* (Paris, 1876), I, 397, or Britton and Brown, *Illus. Flora of U. S. and Canada* (N. Y., 1898), III, 350 (Fig. 3724). The passage also makes clear a line in the *balade* of the *Paradys d'Amours* that led Kervyn de Lettenhove astray in his *Froissart* (I, 135-6; II, 264-5):

Deus coeurs navrés d'une plaisant sajette (l. 1648).

¹ It is of course true, from the very nature of the case, that Chaucer's word has also the meaning assigned to it by Mätzner, Stratmann, and Godefroy; but that has nothing to do with the specific shape of the *Blumenwerk*. Moreover, it is distinctly said (ll. 223-4) that

. . . "the whyte coroun, above the grene,
Made hir lyk a daysie for to sene"—

which would not so clearly be the case on the supposition of a mass of smaller flowers. As for ll. 221-2—

For of o perle fyne, oriental,
Hir whyte coroun was y-maked al—

the meaning is not affected by the interpretation given. For while, in a poem where daisies "surmounten pleyntly alle odoures," pearls may certainly be rendered tractable and the splendid hyperbole of a single pearl admitted, it seems, none the less, more reasonable to take "o" as here meaning "one in kind; the same in quality or nature" (*New Eng. Dic.* s. v. one, 13), and accordingly to picture the "whyte leves" as inlaid in the ordinary fashion with many pearls of one fineness. See *K. T.*, 154: Bothe in *oon armes*; Latimer, *5th Sermon before Edu. VI* (Arber), 149: They are all *one apples*, etc.

instead of *florouns*, the matter assumes some importance in dealing with the problems connected with the revision of the Prologue. Before coming to the relation of the two versions, however, there is another phase of Chaucer's indebtedness in the Prologue to both Deschamps and Froissart that must be considered.¹

¹It should be added, in connection with the side of the subject we are leaving, that there is one quality of the daisy on which the French poets lay stress—namely, its *medicinal* virtue—which Chaucer seems to have ignored. Deschamps refers to it :

De qui vertu puet santé recevoir
Tous langoureux (*Lay de Franchise*, ll. 62-3).

Machault seems even to give voice to the well-known belief that holding the daisy in the hand had medicinal efficacy (see Morley, *Eng. Writers*, v, 134):

Et qui la tient, il ne puet mal avoir (p. 124),

and in English there is an interesting reference in point in the *Boke of Cupide*, ll. 241-5 (ed. Vollmer, p. 41) :

'Yee? use thou,' quoth she, 'this medecyne,
Every day this May, er that thou dyne :
Goo loke upon the fresshe flour daysye ;
And thogh thou be for wo in poynt to dye,
That shal ful gretly lyssen the of thy pyne.'

Anyone who wishes orientation in this general field without turning over for himself the curious and fascinating pages of the pre-Linnaean herbalists—Ruellius, Mattioli, Turner, Parkinson, Ray—will find it most quickly in Zedler's *Grosses vollständiges Universal Lexicon* (Halle u. Leipzig, 1733), in the third of the sixty-four volumes which fulfil the promise of its name, pp. 1060-62. Among the older writers themselves, perhaps the fullest are John Parkinson's *Theatrum Botanicum*, *The Theater of Plantes* (London, 1640), p. 532, and, by the same King's Herbarist, that delightful work whose title plays upon his name, the *Paradisi in Sole, or, A Garden of all sorts of pleasant flowers which our English ayre will permitt to be noursed up* (London, 2d impress, 1656), 320-23, and the reprint (London, 1904) of the ed. of 1629, pp. 320-23; Bauhin, *Historia Plantarum Universalis* (Ebroduni, 1651), III, 111-15; Turner's *New Herball* (1551), f. 11. Morley's enticing reference (*Eng. Writers*, v, 134) to Raymond Minderer's *Medicina Militaris* (1634) pp. 57-60, I have not been able to verify.

III.

Structurally regarded, the B-version of the Prologue falls into two clearly distinguishable parts. The first includes ll. 1-196, and, without any hint whatever of a vision, is devoted to the panegyric of the daisy and the detailed account of a day spent in its honor in the mede, ending with Chaucer's caution that he must not be thought to write

In preysing of the flour agayn the leef. . . .
For this thing is al of another tonne,
Of olde story, er swich thing was begonne.

The second part, including the last 383 lines of the version, is given up to the vision of the god of Love, the nineteen ladies, and Alceste—the device which constitutes the framework on which is built his *Apologia* for “the Rose and eek Crisseyde,” together with his introduction to the *Legend* itself. Now it happens that for both these clearly defined sections of B. there are close structural parallels in two of the poems from which we have already had evidence of borrowing in detail on Chaucer's part—for the first division, and in a measure for the second, in the *Lay de Franchise* of Deschamps; for the second, in Froissart's *Paradys d'Amours*.

In the *Lay de Franchise*, Deschamps begins by speaking of the power of old custom to make sweet the things one has observed from one's youth up :

Much curious, often interesting, and sometimes unreliable information may also be found in M. von Strautz, *Die Blumen in Sage u. Geschichte* (Berlin, 1875), 225-34; Reling u. Bohnhorst, *Unsere Pflanzen* (Gotha, 1882), 249 ff.; Folkard, *Plant Lore, Legend and Lyrics* (London, 1884), 307-8, 430-1; T. Thistleton Dyer, *The Folk-lore of Plants* (New York, 1889), 228 and index; Pritzel u. Jessen, *Die deutschen Volksnamen der Pflanzen* (Hannover, 1882), 55-6; Ulrich, *Internationales Wörterbuch der Pflanzennamen* (Leipzig, 1872), 32; etc. I am indebted to Mr. Frederick Le Roy Sargent for putting me on the track of the old herbalists.

Pour ce que grant chose est d'acoustumance
 Quant on la prant et poursuit des s'enffance
 Dure chose est qu'om se puist retenir
 De la laisser, car la perseverance
 Fait en tous temps qu'a celle chose pance
 Cilz qui en a le tresdoulz souvenir.

Among such things, he includes the doing honor and reverence to May :

Et pour ce vueil a mon propos venir :
 C'est qu'en doulz mois que toute fleur s'avance,
 Arbres, buissons, que terre devenir
 Veult toute vert et ses flours espanir,
 Du moys de may me vint la souvenance
 Dont maintes gens ont la coustume en France
 En ce doulz temps d'aler le may cueillir.

On the first day of May, accordingly, he does his observance :

Le premier jour de ce mois de plaisance
 Qui des amans est la droite esperance,
 Pour coustume du jour entretenir
 Auquel j'ay fait honeur et reverance
 Des que de lui oy vraie congnoissance,
 Sacrifier vould mon cuer et offrir
 Avec le corps et tout le vert vestir
 Au gentil mois qui les doulz cuers avance
 A leurs dames et amours conjour
 Et a ce jour leurs complaints ouir.¹

So far, of course, the *Lay* might be any one of a hundred conventional May-day poems ; but at this point it differentiates itself sharply from the type, by proceeding to focus the May-day worship upon the *marguerite* :

De mon hostel me pars au point du jour.
 Prins et sousprins d'amoureuse douleur,
 M'acheminay pensant par une plaine
 A la beauté de la tresdouce flour
 Qui en bonté, en douçour, en honour
 Et en tous biens, est la flour souveraine.²

¹ Ll. 1-23.

² Ll. 27-32.

The next thirty-three lines, accordingly, are given up to singing—partly after the stereotyped fashion, partly with fresh detail, partly, it will be remembered, in the very phrases that Chaucer seems to have used—the praises of the *marguerite*.¹ It will be noted at once that it is just this concentration of the May-day observances upon the daisy, which constitutes for the B-version of the Prologue its first departure from the conventional type.² Nor has the worship of the daisy in the *Lay de Franchise* the *dream-setting* at all—another fact which detaches it from the greater number of the poems of its class³—and in this, once more, its treatment coincides with that of the first one hundred and ninety-six lines of B, which constitute, as has been noted, a clearly-marked section of that version. Precisely, then, where in these two respects the two treatments depart from the conventions, they come into agreement with each other. After this the poem follows its own course, and passes again for a time into the stock commonplaces of its type—the park, the castle, the *dames et damoiseaulx* gathering flowers, the singing birds, the running waters—though even in the purely conventional part of the *Lay* the passages which parallel Chaucer's use of the same commonplaces should not be ignored.⁴

It is, however, when we pass to the central motive of the poem that the most striking parallel between the *Lay* and

¹ All these lines are quoted or characterized elsewhere in this paper, and may be found as follows : ll. 33-39, on p. 601, n. 3 ; ll. 40-43, on p. 601, n. 3 ; ll. 44-50, on p. 615 ; l. 52, on p. 621 ; ll. 53-61, on p. 639 ; ll. 62-3, on p. 634, n. 1 ; ll. 63-5, on p. 630.

² See Neilson, *Court of Love*, 144.

³ See *ib.*, index, s. v. Dream-setting.

⁴ The long description, for instance, of the birds, “*et li deduis a celles et a ceaulx Qui la furent*” (ll. 101-115) ; and the particularly vivid description of the freshness of the grass (139-143). The *setting* of the action is given in ll. 66-143.

the Prologue appears, for there *the personified flower herself becomes not only one of the dramatis personae, but the central figure of the poem*, since it is her words, addressed to the king, to which all the preceding lines lead up, and on which the rest of the action depends. The king has come upon the scene, surrounded by ladies and chevaliers (144-69), and has decreed the sacrifice to May (170-182), whereupon ensue many *débats* and questions *pour amours*, in the course of which bitter complaint is made of the present state of things (183-208). And now the flower speaks :

*Lors dist la flour, et chascuns l'acorda,
Et par beaus mos saigement recorda
Que sanz amour ne puet estre prouesse ;
Troie la grant tesmoing en appella,
Et par le Bruth sa paroule prouva
Et par Juno, l'amoureuse déesse,
Par Medea qui enseigna l'adresse
Au fort Jason qui les toreaulx dompta,
Par Hercules, qui vainquit mainte presse,
.....
Par Theseus qu'en l'aigle d'or entra.
Convoitise les terres perdu a
Qu' avoit conquis Emprise, Amour, Largesce (209-21).*

The king takes to heart the fair speaker's words—

*Et quant li Roys ces doulz mos escouta
Touz ces .iii. poins a dit qu'il retendra
Avec Deduit, Hardement et Léescce (221-4)—*

and after further emphasis has been laid upon them (225-34), the merry crowd goes dancing to the Château de Beauté, where a rich feast has been prepared (235-60). But the words of the flower have set the poet thinking, and after watching for a time the feast, he seeks the upland where Marion and Robin sing "*une chanson honneste*" as they dip their bread in the cold water of a brook (261-307); and the poem closes with the poet's thanks to the flower for the

lesson she has taught (308-12).¹ Now such a part as this was played by the flower in no other of the *marguerite* poems, and it is most important to note that she speaks here *not at all as a mistress to her lover, but as a favored subject to her king*, in words whose wisdom is quite as much commended as their sweetness. In this respect the poem is so far unique among its class. But it is just the fact that the daisy, personified as Alceste, is the central *dramatis persona* of the Prologue, and that in it she speaks, not as a mistress to her lover, but with the dignity of a counsellor to her king, which has hitherto set the Prologue in a place apart.² In a third most essential respect, then, where the *Lay* and the Prologue diverge from the type, they agree with each other.

There is still another point of contact that should not be overlooked. It has been pointed out that in the Prologue "the description of the lady is *individualized by Chaucer* by the device of making her dress represent the different parts of the daisy."³ For this further individualizing touch one finds again a distinct suggestion in the *Lay*, where, as regards the flower, it is said :

Et il pert bien que chascuns la tient chiere,
 Car je ne voy homme qui ne la quiere
 Et qui porter ne la vueille ou avoir.
Peinte la voy et en mainte maniere
En fins draps d'or, en paroiz, en verriere ;
En moult d'abiz la puet chascun veoir,

¹ See p. 607 for the lines. For like use of Robin and Marion again, see No. 315 (III, 1).

² Bech noted this difference, without knowing the parallel in Deschamps: "Unser dichter ist sich aber zugleich der verschiedenen stellung bewusst, die er in der verehrung des massliebchens jenen leuten [i. e., den lyrischen dichtern] gegenüber einnimmt. Bei ihm ist nicht das massliebchen das sinnbild der liebe und der geliebten (vgl. ten Brink a. a. o.), sondern er personifiziert es als die tugendhafteste frau aus dem alterthum" (*Anglia*, v, 357).

³ Neilson, *Court of Love*, 145. The italics are mine.

*En vaisselle chacun jour percevoir
Comme celle qui est droicte lumiere,
Pierre luisant de precieus sçavoir.*¹

The turn here given to the description of the *marguerite* is peculiar to the *Lay*, as the use of the daisy in the costume of Alceste is peculiar to the Prologue; and while the employment of the daisy in the dress of the *tresdouce flour* herself is not asserted by Deschamps, the passage to such a device on Chaucer's part is a most easy one.

When one considers, then, the verbal parallels, together with the fact that in four essential points the *Lay* and the B-version of the Prologue depart together from well-known and clearly defined conventions, the conclusion becomes almost irresistible that the *Lay de Franchise* served as one of the sources for that particular version of the Prologue.² This harmonizes with the well-known fact that Deschamps sent certain of his works to Chaucer, and asked for a response in kind; with the above-mentioned probability that the Flower and Leaf *balades*, which there is good ground to believe were written about this time, were known to Chaucer when he wrote the Prologue; and finally it adds new force to the interesting con-

¹ Ll. 53-61. Compare, in illustration of Deschamps's statement, the following descriptions of robes, armor, or jewels from the *Itinéraires de Philippe le Hardi*: quatre demi corps . . . frettés de fort or soudés et ouvrés d'or de Chipre dessus, en chaque losange un P, et en l'autre une toffe de marguerites (p. 530, under 1389); un autre pourpoint de veluau . . . estoit couvert de perles. Il y avoit 40 soleils d'or à ce pourpoint et 46 fleurs d'or esmailliées de bleu, et en chaque fleur une clochette d'or en façon de marguerite (ib. 530); Les dits harnois tout semés de marguerites (ib. 533, under 1390); un fermail d'or d'une marguerite et une brebis à quatre rubis, un saphir, six perles (ib. 542, under 1392). It is interesting to note that the last entry, in a list of New Year's gifts of the Duke of Bourgogne, occurs between the names of Guillaume de la Trémouille and Ellion de Neillac.

² It is perhaps worth while to call attention, also, to the interesting parallel to the kernel of Alceste's plea for Chaucer (B. 412-13), found at the close of Deschamps's *Lay amoureuse*, II, 193 ff. (No. 306), ll. 275 to end, esp. ll. 295-8.

jecture recently ventured, that the Prologue itself may have formed part of Chaucer's answer to the message of Deschamps.¹ "Vielleicht," wrote ten Brink, speaking of Deschamps's praise of Chaucer as the *grant translateur*—"vielleicht hoffte er, Meister Geoffrey würde auch ihn übersetzen!"² And certainly no authentic draught from Chaucer's particular rill of Helicon could so effectually quench the "soif ethique" of Eustache Deschamps as a poem which should sow his flowers and plant, like the Rose, his *marguerite*

Aux ignorans de la langue pandras.³

If we turn, now, to the second part of the B-version,

¹ Professor Kittredge, in *Mod. Philol.*, I, p. 6: "If the manuscript which Deschamps sent to Chaucer contained the poems on the Flower and the Leaf, may not Chaucer have replied by sending him the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*, or, indeed, the whole *Legend*, so far as it was ever completed?"

² *Geschichte*, II, 199. "Dies ist nun zwar," he continues, "wie es scheint, nicht geschehen." This last statement, however, as well as Professor Lounsbury's remark that "to him [Deschamps] not a single line of the English poet has so far been traced" (*Studies*, II, 217), seems no longer warranted by the facts.

³ No. 285 (II, 138), l. 10; cf. ll. 22-27. Is it too much to suggest, in this connection, that Chaucer may have had Deschamps's characterization of himself in mind, when he put into the mouth of the Clerk of Oxford the famous lines which speak of

"Fraunceys Petrark, the laureat poete
 . . . whos *rethoryke* sweete
Enlumined al Itaille of poetrye,
 As Linian dide of *philosophye*" ? (E. 31-4.)

Deschamps's lines to Chaucer, it will be remembered, are as follows :

O Socrates plains de *philosophie*,
 Senegue en meurs et Angluxe en pratique,
 Ovides grans en ta *poetrie*,
 Bries en parler, saiges en *rethorique*,
 Aigles treshaultz, qui par ta theorique
Enlumines le regne d'Eneas. (II. 1-6.)

which deals entirely with the vision of the god of Love and of Alceste, we shall find, I think, evidence that the framework of the vision was suggested in large measure by the *Paradys d'Amours* of Froissart. This evidence consists, in part, of parallel groupings of well-known conventions which occur in other combinations elsewhere; and in part, once more, of parallel divergences, in the case of the two poems, from the established conventions—in this instance, those of the Court of Love—which underlie both. It may be well, before considering the parallels of either sort, to have before us a brief outline of the *Paradys* itself.

To find relief from the melancholy thoughts which come to him in his waking hours, because his fair mistress is hard of heart,¹ Froissart prays Morpheus, Juno and Æolus for sleep, until at length Juno sends Iris to Morpheus, and Morpheus sends one of his sons, Enclimpostair,² to the suppliant, who then falls asleep (1–28). In his sleep he dreams he is in a fair wood, with great plenty of grass, trees, flowers, the noise of the singing of birds; and the time is the month of May (29–45). He goes up and down, listening to the birds, who are splitting their throats singing in accord of loving *par amours*, and seats himself beneath two boughs of hawthorn, all in bloom (45–61). There he proceeds to fall into despair, and makes a long love-complaint, in which, invoking Love, he tells him how he had done him homage, and how Love had retained him for his servant, and promised reward, if he served loyally; how he *had* served and obeyed a very long time, yet in spite of all

¹ The parallelism between these opening lines and those of *The Book of the Duchesse* was first pointed out by Sandras, *Étude* (1859), p. 90.

² The dispute as to whether Froissart or Chaucer was the borrower of this name has been finally settled by Professor Kittredge in the article in *Englische Studien*, xxvi, 321–36—a conclusion which makes it certain that Chaucer knew, and in 1369 had used, the *Paradys d'Amours*.

his lady would not listen to his prayer. "If," he continues, "if you had told me then, when I gave you heart and body all entire, keeping nothing back—if you'd said: 'You shall never have any comfort from your lady,' it would have been different; but when I recall the great solace you promised me then, of which I've had nothing, I say alas! and know well that you will be the death of me." He goes on, in fact, to charge Love flatly with betraying him, and includes in the arraignment Plaisance, who had also promised him success (62–202). "Indeed," he concludes, still addressing Plaisance:

"Jà je te soeil
Honnourer, loer et chierer,
Mès je te maudis par aïr.
Mors, prens moi tos, el ne desire
Ne el ne voeil" (198–202).

In a word, the complaint could not be better summed up than in the phrase of the God of Love in his indictment of Chaucer:

. . . . [thou] holdest hit folye
To serve Love. (B. 326–7.)

The complaint ended, Froissart sits with bent head, nor does the singing of the birds touch him at all, nor would all the birds there are, even to Alsace.¹ As he sits, he hears the bushes breaking violently beside him, and feels some fear. He covers himself with the branches, and opens his eyes a little to see what it can be (203–335). Very quickly two ladies come to him,

. . . . le plus esmerées,
Plus gentes et mieuls coulourées,
Que image fait de peinture.
.

¹ The situation recalls very vividly Chaucer's picture of the "man in blak," in the *Book of the Duchesse*, 445 ff.

Leur abit estoient royal; ¹
 Jamais ne vous auroie dit
 Leur grant beauté ne leur abit (237-45).

One of the ladies says: "I've found the wretch; forward, friend, at him, at him! Well he deserves a beating; he's come walking here in our master's garden, and of our master he's had little good to say:

"S'est il venus yci esbatre
 Ens el clos et ens ou vregié
 Que nostres mestres a vregié
 Et ouvré à ses propres mains,
 Et puis li fauls en dist le mains
 De biens qu'onques felist nuls homs" (250-5).²

Froissart would have fled, had he been able, but determines instead to pray for mercy, which he does, asking the ladies, also, who their master is—the son of a duke or a king, to judge by their array; surely such as they will show mercy (256-283). "He is right," says one lady to her companion:

"Car voir dist, nous ne sommes nées
 Ne dedans ce monde ordonnées
 Que pour faire misericorde
 Au suppliant qui se recorde
 De son meffet et merci prie;
 Pités est dedans nous nourie
 Et nos mestres le voelt ensi" (285-91).³

They should, she says, free the man from care, and have pity

¹ "And she was clad in *real habit* grene," B. 214; . . . "ladyës nyntene In *real habit*," B. 283-4. The quotations which follow from the Prologue, in connection with the outline of the *Paradys*, are rather to keep in mind the general parallelism of the two poems, than to imply, in any given case, a *specific* borrowing on Chaucer's part.

² Compare the charge of trespass on Love's territory, and that of his flower, brought against Chaucer by the god of Love in B. 310 ff.

³ Compare the passage in B. ending with ll. 403 ff:

And if so be he may him nat excuse,
 But asketh mercy with a dredful herte, etc.

on him. The other agrees ; Froissart greatly rejoices ; and the one who has just spoken comes forward and taking him by the hand bids him advance, since it pleases her companion to show him mercy ; none the less he has done, she insists, a very great wrong to their master and to herself. Froissart again asks the name of the master of the garden, and of the lady herself, whom he says explicitly he does not know that he has ever seen :

Et vous aussi, ma chiere dame,
Ne vos cognois ; nennil, par m'ame,
Je ne sçai, se je vous vi onques (321-3).

"By your own words," says the lady, "you know our master, and it was I who brought you to him. You recounted the affair to-day from beginning to end :

"Compains, par ta parolle,
.
Nostre mestre tu cognois bien ;
Tu dis qu'il t'a en son lyen
Et qu' ommage jà li fesis
Et que son homme devenis
Et qu' aussi je le te fis faire.
Bien en as hui compté l'afaire
De chief jusqu' en conclusion" (325-333).¹

She was present, she says, when he did homage to the god of Love ; she it was who opened for him the gate by which

¹Cf. B. 498 ff :

'Wostow' quod he, 'wher this be wyf or mayde,
Or quene, or countesse, or of what degree ?
.
And I answerde, 'nay, sir, so have I blis,
No more but that I see wel she is good.'
'That is a trewe tale, by myn hood,'
Quod Love, 'and that thou knowest wel, pardee,
If hit be so that thou avyse thee.
.
And I answerde ageyn, and seyde, 'yis,
Now knowe I hir !' etc.

he entered into the hostel. She thereupon gives her name as Plaisance—the one, it will be noted, of whom he had just ceased speaking (151–4, 187–203); that of her companion as Esperance; that of her master as the god of Love (324–57). Froissart responds :

‘ Dame ’ di je, ‘ or sui en liece,
Puisque Plaisance, estes nommée,
Moult vaut partout vo renommée ’ (358–60).¹

“ True,” replies Plaisance :

“ Mès tu as hui nostre ordenance
Diffamée trop grandement ” (368–9).²

Froissart asks how, and she replies :

Tu as reprocié ton seignour.

She then points out to him at length the injustice of his complaint (373–444). Froissart is interested, and wishes to know more. Plaisance explains, accordingly, her relation to Love and lovers, concluding by telling how, for those who have received her, he redresses their great pain, when they serve him loyally :

Ne des losengeours n’a cure (549).

“ Give him your heart ; ” she urges, “ no greater master can you have ; he cares not for your possessions, but your heart he will have for his own ” (445–561). “ Lady,” says Froissart, “ my heart and my body too are entirely at his mercy ; will you not use your influence on my behalf ? ”

¹ Cf. B. 518 ff :

. . . . And is this good Alceste,
The dayeseye, and myn owne hertes reste ?
Now fele I wel the goodnesse of this wyf,
.
Hir grete bountee doubleth hir renoun !

² Cf. B. 330 : That is an heresy ageyns my lawe.
B. 336 : For, thogh that thou reneyed hast my lay.

“Car je sueffre grant penitance
Et je croi que bien le savés” (568-9).¹

He tells her, then, how she whom he loves more than his soul had refused him comfort; how he had gone to the god of Love and said to him :

. . . Ha, chier sires, j'aim
La flour sus trestoute aultre flour (592-3);²

how the god of Love had demanded his homage, and since then had abandoned him to his pains. Of that, he goes on, would he could speak to him !

Volentiers je li mousterioie
Le dangier ouquel il m'a mis,
Qui sui son serf et ses amis (606-8).

Esperance then enters the conversation, and points out to Froissart that the trouble lies in the fact that he has tasted the cup of jealousy (615-689). If he can put that aside, she will be, she declares, his advocate :

. . . Je serai ton advocas
Soit à Amours, soit à ta dame (692-3).

After listening to a splendid glorification of her powers (720-800), Froissart asks where the god of Love sojourns : “Before day dawns, I pray you, take me to him” (801-814). Esperance refers him to Plaisance, the gardener of the close; he makes his request of her, and it is granted. They go together, chanting a *rondel*; pass a youth—Doule Penser—with two fair greyhounds, and ask if the god of Love is there; but learning that they will find him by the fountain of Narcissus, go on, singing another *rondel* (815-902). As they pass along the woods—

L'ombre une heure et puis les herbois—

¹ Cf. B. 368 : Or him repenteth utterly of this.

² Cf. B. 53 : As she, that is of alle floures flour, etc.

they meet other youths—Beaus Samblans, Bien Besongnans, Douls Regars—with dogs (903–925). “Lord help me, lady,” says Froissart :

“Ma dame, ensi m’aït Jhesus,”
Di je, “que veci bon esbat!
Moult volentiers oi le debat
Et l’abai de ces chiens courans” (926–29).¹

Tell me—I’m ignorant of it—are all the men hunters to the god of Love?” After learning that they are, he looks down a glade, and sees a great company of dames and damsels, fresh, fair and beautiful, and a great crowd of youths, who have stopped there, and are all ready to dance (930–964):

Tout estoient de vert vesti,
N’i avoit ceste ne cesti.
Les dames furent orfrisies,
Drut perlées et bien croisies,
Et li signeur avoient cor
D’ivoire bendé de fin or (965–70).

“Lady,” says Froissart, “may I know who these I see here are?” Plaisance then gives the list, including Troilus,² Paris, Lancelot, Tristan, Iseult (!), Perceval, Guiron, Galahad, Modred, Meliador,³ Tangis,³ Camel de Camois,³ Agravaine, Iwain and Gawain, among the men; among the women, Helen, the Chatelaine de Vergy, Guinevere, Iseult again, Hero, Polyxena, Echo, Medea. Thence they pass to the entrance of Love’s paradise (970–1004), reaching at last a glade, where is spread the pavilion of the god of Love. Plaisance now urges Froissart to present his affair to the

¹ Compare the passage in the *Book of the Duchesse* beginning with line 348.

² It is worth noting again that we have here a reference to Troilus as a lover—heading, indeed, the list of lovers—before 1369. See Tatlock in *Mod. Phil.*, I, 323, n.

³ For the significance of the occurrence of these names, see *Englische Studien*, xxvi, 330 ff.

god, in a *Lay*; he agrees, and they come into Love's tent. Plaisance encourages him, then falls on her knees before her master, and asks him to hear the suppliant (1005-1063). Love grants a hearing (1064-78), and Froissart recites his *Lay*, which is very long (1079-1354), stating his case in a more humble and conciliatory tone, and closes—after speaking of the pain and anguish he had suffered from Refus and Dangier—with a prayer to Pité and Droiture to go to his lady without delay in his behalf:

Et si muast la nature
De Refus et de Dangier,
Car par ces deus tant endure
De painne et d'angousse dure
Ne la diroit creature.
.
Or tos! Pité et Droiture,
Alés vous en bonne alure
A ma dame, etc. (1327-31, 1335-7).¹

Love accepts his words, and, after fresh advice, sends him with the two ladies into the garden to walk; whence, as they go singing a *virelay* and gathering flowers, they come into a meadow where daisies are growing and birds are singing, and there he finds Bel Acueil weaving chaplets of flowers. At once he goes and kneels before his lady—for she it is whom Bel Acueil symbolizes—and tells her that Love has bidden him ask grace of her (1355-1500). Into the dialogue between them (1501-94) it is not necessary to our purpose to enter; but finally she takes him by the hand:

Et sus l'erbe fresce et nouvelle
Commençames nous à marcir (1596-7).

The lady asks Froissart if he has made anything new:

¹ Cf. B. 160-3:

Al founde they Daunger for a tyme a lord,
Yet Pitee, through his stronge gentil might,
Forgaf, and made Mercy passen Right.

‘Avés vous riens fait de nouvel?’
 Ce dist elle moult doucement.
 ‘Oïl, dame, de sentement
 Et de coer amoureux et sade
 Ai ordonné une balade’ (1602-6).

She replies that while he recites it she will make him a chaplet of flowers. They sit down, and while she makes the chaplet—

. . . . de flours petites
 Que nous appellons margherites,
 Qui croissoient ens ou preel (1621-3)—

Froissart recites the *balade* whose first stanza names flower after flower, only to dismiss them in favor of the *marguerite*:

Sus toutes flours tient on la rose à belle,
 Et en après, je croi, la violette;
 La flour de lys est belle, et la perselle;
 La flour de glay est plaisans et parfette;
 Et li pluisour aiment moult l’anquellie,
 Le pyone, le muget, la soussie.
 Cascune flour a par li son merite;
 Mès je vous di, tant que pour ma partie,
 Sus toutes flours j’aime la margherite (1627-35).

The lady smiles as she listens, and Plaisance asks her why:

De quoi ryés vous, bonne et belle?
 Ceste balade est bien nouvelle,
 Car onques mès je ne l’oï (1658-60).

She graciously replies that the ballad is very good, and it is right that its maker should have the chaplet:

Le chapelet qui fu estrois
 Frema elle, de ses beaux doïs,
 De la flour où je me delitte
 Que je vous nomme margherite (1670-73).

She makes Froissart kiss it, kisses it herself, and crowns him with it. “Come, come,” she says “let us walk in another place!” Froissart wakes, feels his bed to be sure he’s not asleep, and falls to thinking of his dream (1675-1723).

I have given this abstract to the bitter end, with all its tediousnesses on its head, because, if it be true that Chaucer draws in part from the *Paradys* the framework of his Prologue, nothing could better illustrate his consummate skill in handling conventional material than the patent differences between the two. The evidence for such influence of the *Paradys* it will now be necessary to consider.

It has been well pointed out, in the work which has done so much to make clear the whole subject of mediæval love-allegory,¹ with reference to such features as, among others, "the May-morning landscape, with streams and flowers and birds, the presenting of 'complaints' and 'bills'; the nymph who acts as guide and interpreter"—that "such conceptions occurring in any two poems tell nothing whatever about the immediate relations of these poems. It is necessary, therefore,"—to use for the present case the words which Dr. Neilson applied to the *Court of Love*—"if we are to prove anything with regard to those sources which actually suggested certain features of the [Prologue], to find either striking parallelisms in detail which cannot be set aside as commonplaces, or the presence of some distinct feature which in itself is not a regular part of poems of the type." It must be remembered, however, that once granted the presence of such parallelisms as have been referred to, the greater the number of similar groupings of conventions one also finds common to both, the stronger becomes the corroboratory evidence of relation.

In the case of the *Paradys* and the B-version of the Prologue, then, we may cut out at once the dream-setting, the May landscape, the meadow full of flowers—except that we must note the important fact that in both these meadows the flowers are *daisies*—the birds singing of loving *par amours*,

¹ Neilson, *Court of Love*, p. 228.

the presence of a lady who serves as advocate before the god of Love, the company in green attire about the god of Love, and the mention of Danger, Pity, and Right. There are still left the following parallels: the offender found in Love's domain and charged with trespassing;¹ the further charge of heresy against Love's law, based on what the offender has said or sung;² the distinct recognition, on the part of the lady in royal habit, that her master owes mercy to the suppliant;³ ignorance on the part of the offender that this lady is after all someone of whom he has already known;⁴ the plea of repentance on the offender's part, or on his behalf;⁵ and the specific glorification of the poet's lady, centering in a *balade*, under the name or form of the daisy.⁶ That is to say, the framework, the *cadre* of the *Paradys* is in striking agreement with that of the second part of the B-version of the Prologue—making allowance for the important fact already accounted for, that the lady for whom the daisy stands has become, instead of the poet's mistress, the counsellor of the god of Love. The similarity is disguised by the fact that Froissart's framework is filled out entirely—the *marguerite* element excepted—with the old conventional abstractions, while Chaucer's serves merely as a clever device for setting forth the vividly concrete details of an actual situation—the state, that is, of his own poetical fortunes, past, present, and to come. Nor is this all; for if one glance over the outlines of the other poems of the type, antecedent to Chaucer, as given by Dr. Neilson in his *Court of Love*, it will be seen that the agreement of the two poems under discussion in their common *omissions* is almost as remarkable as their parallelism in what they include. And of the very few important conventions which appear in the *Paradys* but not in the Prologue, that of

¹ See p. 644.² See p. 646.³ See p. 644.⁴ See pp. 645-6.⁵ See p. 647.⁶ See p. 650.

the huntsmen of the god of Love¹ has given a suggestion which Chaucer seems already to have used after his own fashion in the *Book of the Duchesse*.²

But if it is not sufficient to find brought together in the Prologue the same elements which are brought together in the *Paradys*, with omission of the same features which the *Paradys* omits, we may apply the final test. It is dangerous to indulge in universal negations with regard to so large a *genre* as the Court of Love poems, but it seems clear that among the common elements just noted there are at least two striking parallelisms in detail which can scarcely be set aside as commonplaces. And they deal, as it happens, with precisely the two situations in the Prologue whose connection with the remainder of the action is most puzzling—the two, in fact, which have long been seen to involve direct contradictions with the rest of the poem. The one is the handling of the belated recognition on the part of the offender that the lady who acts as his advocate is after all someone whom he has already known; the other is the part played by the *balade*.

The situation in which Froissart disclaims all knowledge of his advocate Plaisance, is assured at once that he does really know her, with citation of identifying facts, and thereupon delightedly acknowledges that it is so³—this situation so strikingly parallels in its treatment that in which the god of Love asks Chaucer if he knows the lady who has served him, with the accompanying denial, assurance, and acknowledgment, that it seems hardly possible to regard it as a mere commonplace. It is true, as Dr. Schofield has recently pointed out in another connection,⁴ that “the failure of a poet at first to recognize his allegorical visitant had by this time

¹ See p. 648.

² *Ib.*, note 1.

³ pp. 645–6.

⁴ “The Nature and Fabric of *The Pearl*” (*Pubs. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, xix, 179).

become almost a convention." But in the present case it is the poet's own emphatic denial of all previous knowledge, after a statement or question implying that he *ought* to know, which seems to differentiate the instances under discussion from the type. Such a dramatic heightening of the situation by a denial is not found in any of the examples to which reference has been made—in the *Pearl*,¹ in the *Vision of Piers Plowman*,² in *Death and Life*,³ or in the *De Consolatione Philosophiae* of Boethius.⁴ That it does occur in two poems—each devoted to the praise of the daisy—from one of which the author of the other had certainly borrowed previously,⁵ seems hardly likely to be due to mere coincidence, and the fact, already pointed out, that the situation is but one of a large number of correspondences between the two, renders the evidence so far cumulative.⁶

Moreover, it will be remembered that in this very recognition of Alceste as if for the first time—"Now knowe I hir ! And is this good Alceste ?" (B. 518)—lies one of the *crucis* no less of B. than of A., inasmuch as in B. 432 the lady has already distinctly announced her name—"I, your Alceste, whylom quene of Trace"—so that the information of the

¹ Where the poet distinctly says, on the appearance of the visitant : "I knew hyr wel, I hade sen hyr ere, etc." (ed. Gollancz, stanza 14).

² Where the author merely wonders, asks, and has reply. See ed. Skeat (Oxford, 1886), I, 20 ff ; Schofield, *loc. cit.*

³ Where the poet marvels who the woman is, turns to Sir Comfort, asks, and is answered. See Percy Folio MS. (London, 1868), III, 49 ff ; Schofield, *op. cit.* 179, n. 2, 196.

⁴ Where the question is put by Philosophy herself, but the denial is absent. See particularly Chaucer's translation, Bk. I, Prose ii and iii ; Schofield, *loc. cit.*

⁵ See p. 642, n. 2.

⁶ Even should a parallel elsewhere be found for the *heightening* of the situation, the addition of the situation itself to the large number of similar groupings of conventions common to the two poems, would still have evidential value.

god of Love has been anticipated by Alceste herself.¹ Nor is this previous mention of Alceste in B. of the nature of an aside on the poet's part, in which he takes his readers into his confidence, naming her name, and telling them plainly who and what she is. That may certainly be said² of the first mention of Alceste in A.—“Hir name was Alceste the debonayre; I preye to god that ever falle she fayre” (179–80); but the words of B. 432 form part of the action, and are spoken in the poet's hearing. If, however, one grant the influence of the *Paradys* passage upon B., the matter becomes, if still not quite clear, at least a good deal clearer. For in the concentration of his interest for the moment upon the borrowed situation the poet, one may safely infer from many analogies, might far more readily overlook a discrepancy with what had gone before, than where the given situation was part and parcel of a plan original with himself. The very contradiction thus involved becomes, accordingly, though not conclusive, yet in a manner corroborative evidence for the outside influence.³

As to the second detail, the common celebration of the daisy comes in each poem to a focus in a *balade*, and these *balades* show striking similarities in substance, in function, and in treatment. That of the *Paradys* is sung by the poet himself of his lady, whose name is Marguerite, and files a bead-roll of the other flowers, which, despite their merits, the *marguerite* surpasses—as “passeth all,” it is implied, “[his] lady sovereyne.” The *balade* in the B-version of the Prologue is also sung, not as in A. by the attendant ladies, but as in the *Paradys*, by the poet himself, though the direct movement of the poem is thereby sharply

¹ For discussion of this contradiction, see, especially, Binz, *Anglia, Beiblatt*, XI, 232–4.

² As Professor Kittredge has pointed out to me.

³ The situation in A. will be discussed later.

interrupted, and the time changed from past to present.¹ It is likewise distinctly asserted that it is sung of his lady, who has just been identified with the daisy.² Since, however, in the Prologue the praises of the daisy have been already sung—in part in the phraseology of this very *balade*—the *balade* of B., instead of keeping the allegory of rival flowers, names directly rather than symbolically the rival bearers of his lady's qualities, with the same conclusion that

. . . . certeynly, alle these mow nat suffice
To apperen with my lady in no wyse.³

The likeness, moreover, extends from substance and function to the more general treatment of the *balade* in the two poems. The *balade* of the *Paradys* forms, in one aspect, the real climax of the action; while from another point of view it gives distinctly the impression of being tacked on as an afterthought. It forms the climax, in that the whole poem leads up to the reconciliation between Froissart and his lady,

¹ See B. 247–8: And therfor may I seyn, as thinketh me,
This song, in preysing of this lady fre.

So sharp is the interruption as to lead Dr. Mather, for instance, to speak of the poet as singing the *balade* "to himself, we must suppose" (*Prologue, Knight's Tale*, etc., p. xxv). And how else, indeed, can it well be taken?

² See B. 270–1: This balade may ful wel y-songen be,
As I have seyde erst, by my lady free, etc.

³ The change in the *balade* of the Prologue once rendered necessary by the previous use of the material of Froissart's *balade*, the new form adopted by Chaucer belonged, as we should expect, to a well-known type. See, for instances, in addition to the parallel referred to by Mr. Skeat (*Oxford Chaucer*, III, 298; now printed in Deschamps, *Oeuvres*, x, xlix), the following in Deschamps: No. 313 (II, 336, ll. 17 ff.); No. 546 (III, 389); No. 651 (IV, 110); No. 778 (IV, 279); No. 1274 (VII, 13–14); etc. Compare, for a parallel case, the manner in which Chaucer, after he had used, in the opening stanzas (1–6) of Bk. III of the *Troilus*, the material of Troilus' song found in *Filostrato*, III, stanzas 74–9, substituted for the already used stanzas of the *Filostrato*, when he finally came to Troilus' song, a paraphrase of Boethius II, metre 8 (*Troilus*, III, 1744–68).

which the *balade*, after a fashion, seals. Yet the connection of this whole closing scene with what precedes it is decidedly loose, and the impression of an afterthought is borne out by the fact that the *balade* exists independently in another form, in which the third stanza is entirely different, pointing to earlier composition at some period when, perhaps, Froissart was kept from communication with his lady.¹ The *balade* of the B-version of the Prologue also plays an equally important part, not only through the emphasis that is laid on it when it is introduced, but in the fact that it is twice referred to later by the god of Love—once to condemn the poet's failure to include Alceste;² once to identify the ladies named in it with the subjects of the proposed *Legend*.³ Yet it too is woven but loosely into the texture of the Prologue—so loosely, indeed, as to involve certain somewhat disconcerting contradictions. For not only is the direct movement of the poem interrupted, as we have seen, by its introduction, but the god of Love refers to it as something known to himself,⁴ though it is not represented as sung in his presence; and whereas the final reference to it⁵ leads one to expect in it mention of women only, one finds, in fact, that it includes men's names as well. A comparison with the situation in the *Paradys*, however, seems fairly to entitle one to say that the puzzling treatment of the *balade* in the B-version of the Prologue is simply what might readily be expected under the influence of such a loosely framed original as is offered by the *balade* and its setting in the last scene of Froissart's poem. And the comparison, in its place, of B with A will probably add weight to such a view.

All this evidence is strengthened, moreover, by the fact—

¹ The variant stanza is given in *Oeuvres*, ed. Scheler, I, 368-9; cf. II, 371.

² B. 537 ff.

³ B. 554 ff.

⁴ B. 537-9; cf. ten Brink, in *Eng. Stud.* xvii, 16 ff.

⁵ B. 554 ff.

now put beyond dispute—that Chaucer knew and had already borrowed from the *Paradys d'Amours*, as long before as 1369. Nor is it conceivable that at a time when he was avowedly drawing upon the poems which sang the praises of the *marguerite*, he should fail to have the *Paradys* again in mind.

In detail and in structure, then, the B-version of the Prologue seems to have been strongly influenced by the French *marguerite* poems and, in at least one passage, by the *Filostrato*.¹ It remains to see what light the facts so far indicated may throw upon the puzzling problem of the relative chronology of the two versions of the Prologue.

IV.

It will be seen at once that it becomes possible to introduce an entirely new factor into the discussion of the problem. For instead of being forced, as heretofore, to confine ourselves to the comparison of the two versions with *each other*, we are now able to compare each with a *third* something—to wit, the French and Italian originals already pointed out. And that gives interesting results. It will be simplest

¹ But what becomes, there will be those who ask, of the originality of the Prologue—particularly of the famous and beautiful lines in celebration of the daisy itself? What of the effect upon one's feeling for the beauty of the poet's work? The question is a fair one; and yet perhaps it cannot be too often said that facts like these "forbode not any severing of our loves." The difficulty back of such a question lies in this—that one persists in bringing modern preconceptions to a mediæval case; that to times when property-rights in other men's work were literally "free as the road, as large as store," one keeps applying what are to-day the inexorable implications of *mine* and *thine*. So soon as one comes to see that for the older literature the question of the source of its material has, beside the imaginative handling of it, absolutely no ethical and only indirectly any æsthetic significance, so soon is one rewarded for the possible relinquishment of one delight, by the more habitual sway of a larger and certainly a truer sense of what originality really is. These things are truisms—but truisms, perhaps, rather in theory than application.

to follow the order already adopted, and consider first the passage (B. 40-96) which centres about Chaucer's acknowledgment of indebtedness. We have seen that in B. this falls into three parts: 1. the *cento* of echoes from the French poets (40-67); 2. the address to these poets themselves (68-83); 3. the adaptation of the *Filostrato* stanzas (84-96). It will be best to examine each of these sections separately in its relation to A.

In the first passage (ll. 40-67), A. and B. are identical, with a single exception,¹ for the first eight lines (40-47; see pp. 612-13). Then A. goes on as follows:

48. To seen *these floures* agein the sonne sprede,
49. Whan it up-riseth *by the morwe shene*,
50. *The longe day*, thus walking in the grene.
51. And whan the sonne ginneth *for to weste*,
52. Than closeth hit, and draweth hit to reste.
53. So sore hit is afered of the night,
54. T'il on the morwe, that hit is dayes light.
55. This dayesye, of alle floures flour,
56. Fulfid of vertu and of alle honour,
57. And ever y-lyke fair and fresh of hewe,
58. As wel in winter as in somer newe,
59. Fain wolde I preisen, if I coude aright;
60. But wo is me, hit lyth nat in my might!

If one looks, now, at these lines of A. and the corresponding lines of B.² in their relation to the French originals, it is clear at a glance that the lines in B. are simply a heaping up, in accordance with no definite order of time, of phrases borrowed from the *marguerite* poems, while the corresponding passage in A. is a carefully arranged chronological sequence of a few of the same details. B. begins with morning (49), passes at once to the rehearsal of the virtues of the

¹ B. 40: Now have I *than swich* a condicioun.

A. 40: " " " *therto this* "

² See pp. 613-15. The italics are there omitted to avoid confusion in comparing with the French. The word-order differs in A. 56 and B. 54.

flower and the declaration of the poet's own love for it (50-59)—making utter shipwreck of grammar (52-3) in piecing the gleanings together!—comes then to evening (60), and goes back without transition to daylight (64), influenced in the latter instance, as it happens, by the passage in Deschamps on which Chaucer had his eye without regard to what preceded in his own lines. In other words, the order of B. is the comparatively accidental order suggested by its originals as they occur to the writer's mind, and its unity that of a series of passages more or less closely joined together without entirely losing each its own identity. The A-version, on the other hand, begins likewise with morning (49), provides for the long day (50), passes to evening (51-3), implies the duration of the night (53-4)—

So sore hit is afered of *the night*,
T'il on the morwe—

brings us to the morning once more, completing the circle of the twenty-four hours, and only then comes to its climax in the rehearsal of the virtues of the flower, which it at last takes up into the cycle, no longer of the day, but of the year itself—

As wel in winter as in somer newe (58).

That is to say, the order of A. is entirely independent of such suggestion from without as dominates B., the steady forward movement noted being attained largely through two lines—50 and 54—which are neither in B. nor in the originals, while its unity is the organic unity of a single clearly-defined conception with beginning, middle, and end. Assume, now, that Chaucer, his head full of the “goodly wordes” of the “fresshe songes” he has just read, sits down and weaves together the phrases as they come, pronouns and all, until, the inadequacy of his English “to folowe word by

word [here] curiositee"¹ coming over him, he breaks out into the half humorous appeal for help; assume further that much later, the words of the originals long out of mind, he comes back to the passage on its own merits, and turns the loosely-linked *cento* into a compact, close-knit unit—make these two assumptions, and the two versions seem so far adequately accounted for.² On the other hand, in the light

- ¹ And eek to me hit is a greet penaunce,
 Sith rym in English hath swich scarsitee,
 To folowe word by word the curiositee
 Of Graunson, flour of hem that make in Fraunce.

The Complaynt of Venus, 79–82.

Compare Deschamps's apology for his translation of Pope Innocent :

A tous et toutes m'excuse
 Se de trop vil langage use
 En traittant ceste matire
 Dont la sentence est infuse
 Et plus en latin confuse
 Que je ne sçauroie dire.

No. 309^b (II, 285), § xxvii.

² There are other evidences in the passage of close and careful revision. The change already noted (p. 659, n. 1) from "*than swich a*" (B. 40) to "*therto this*" (A. 40) avoids the awkward phrase "*Now have I than*" etc., as well as the repetition of "*than*" in the next line but one. The substitution of "*this flour*" (B. 48) for "*these floures*" (A. 48) obviates the ambiguity of "*it*" in the succeeding line, and also brings A. 48 into agreement with A. 42, as contrasted with the divergence of the corresponding lines in B. Moreover, while Deschamps's contrast between *obscur* ("derknesse," B. 63) and *clarté* ("brightness," B. 64) is in its *general sense* retained in A. 53–4 (part, now, of the definite time-order of A.), his *phraseology* is no longer followed (p. 615, n. 3)—precisely the sort of change we should expect where a passage written with the eye on a foreign original is later revised with the eye on its relations to its own context. This change, on revision, away from conformity with the wording of the original and into conformity with the English context seems to have taken place in scores of instances in Chaucer's revision of the *Troilus*. See, for a few easily accessible examples, the half-dozen instances given in the *Globe Chaucer*, in the marginal notes to *Troilus* i, 83, 85, 111, 124, 442, 546. Others are cited in the report of a paper by Professor W. S. McCormick, in the *Academy*, 21 Dec., 1895 (No. 1233), p. 552. A set of the proof-sheets

of the relation of the two passages to their sources the opposite order, *without a special motive*, is practically inconceivable. Leaving the possibility of such a motive for consideration in a moment, let us examine the appeal to the poet-lovers (68-83) in the two versions.

The essential thing is, that in A. it is not an appeal at all! Lines 68-72 of B., with their direct request for furtherance in his labor (see page 611), do not appear, and the remainder of the paragraph is as follows :

61. For wel I wot, that *folk* han her-beforn
62. Of making ropen, and lad a-wey the corn ;
63. And I come after, *glening* here and there,
64. And am ful glad if I may find an ere
65. Of any goodly word that *they* han left.
66. And *if* it happe me rehersen eft
67. That *they* han in *her* fresshe songes sayd,
68. *I hope that they wil nat ben evel apayd,*
69. *Sith hit is seid in forthering and honour*
70. *Of hem that either serven leef or flour.*

If one compare these lines, now, with the corresponding lines of B.,¹ a small but extremely significant group of variants appears. For to every pronoun of the *second* person in

there referred to as containing the fuller list is in the Harvard Library. To enter further into the parallels for the present purpose, however, would be to anticipate the results of Dr. Tatlock's investigations for the *Troilus*, soon to be published.

It is true that A. 58 introduces a new detail—"As wel in winter as in somer newe"—which parallels the *marguerite* poems. This is, however, but one such instance in A. against all those pointed out for B. ; it rounds out, as we have seen, a definite movement in time ; and it is not a *verbal* parallel at all—unless, indeed, we assume that it is borrowed from the *Plaidoirie* (see p. 600, n. 6), written, according to Gröber, in 1392, and accordingly among the poems which in 1394 Froissart brought back with him to England and presented to King Richard (see Kervyn de Lettenhove, *Chroniques*, I, i, 374 ff. ; Darmesteter, *Froissart*, 133 ff.). See also p. 617, n. 1. It should be observed, moreover, that the change noted does away with the three-fold repetition of "*ever*" in B. 55-7.

¹ See pp. 611-12.

B. corresponds a pronoun of the *third* person, or its equivalent, in A.¹ Assume, now, that B. was written with the *marguerite* poems fresh in mind, and the apostrophe to their writers becomes the spontaneous expression of the feeling of the moment. Assume, further, a revision when the *marguerite* songs had themselves become an "olde story," and the change from *ye* to *they* records exactly the natural change of attitude towards the poems :

The thing is torned into was ;
That which was whilom grene gras,
Is welked hey at time now.²

If, on the other hand, one assume the opposite order of composition, the change from *they* to *ye* seems inexplicable.³

The third section of the passage under consideration—the paraphrase of the *Filostrato* lines (B. 84–96)—does not occur in A. at all. In its place is found the second Flower and Leaf passage (A. 71–80), which in B. (188–96) occurs 105 lines later. Passing for a moment the significance of the absence from A. of the *Filostrato* lines, it is clear that a greater unity of impression is secured by the juxtaposition of the two paragraphs which deal with the Flower and the Leaf, than by their entire separation as in B. Once put together, they are seen to belong together, and it seems very difficult, on any hypothesis, to assign a reason for their severance. But there are also certain variations in detail which indicate the priority of

¹ See B. 73 = A. 61 ; B. 77 = A. 65 ; B. 79–81 = A. 67–69.

² Gower, *Confessio Amantis*, VIII, 2435–7.

³ With this interpretation harmonize the changes in A. 69–70, which not only eliminate the pronoun of the second person, but actually include the substance of the omitted couplet, B. 71–2—

To forthren me somewhat in my labour,
Whether ye ben with the leef or with the flour—

and give, as will be seen at a glance, by the inclusion of *both* leaf and flower instead of flower alone (as in B. 82) the link needed for the immediately following lines of A., now to be considered.

the arrangement in B. I shall set the two passages side by side, italicising as usual the words peculiar to each :

A.	B.
	186. I pray to god that faire mot she falle,
71. <i>For trusteth wel, I ne have nat</i>	187. And alle that loven floures, for hir sake !
<i>undertake</i>	
72. <i>As of the leef, ageyn the flour, to</i>	188. <i>But natheles, ne wene nat that I</i>
<i>make ;</i>	<i>make</i>
73. <i>Ne of the flour to make, ageyn the</i>	189. <i>In preysing of the flour agayn</i>
<i>leef,</i>	<i>the leef,</i>
74. No more than of the corn ageyn	190. No more than of the corn agayn
the sheef.	the sheef :
75. For, as to me, is leefer noon ne	191. For, as to me, <i>nis</i> lever noon
lother ;	ne lother ;
76. I am with-holde yit with never	192. I <i>nam</i> with-holden yit with
nother.	never nother.
77. I not who serveth leef, ne who	193. <i>Ne</i> I not who serveth leef, ne
the flour ;	who the flour ;
78. <i>That nis nothing the entent of my</i>	194. <i>Wel brouken they hir service or</i>
<i>labour.</i>	<i>labour ;</i>
79. For this <i>werk</i> is al of another	195. For this <i>thing</i> is al of another
tonne,	tonne,
80. Of olde story, er swich <i>stryf</i> was	196. Of olde story, er swich <i>thing</i>
begunne.	was begunne.

It will be noticed at once that the paragraph in B. begins with the *second* line (188) of a couplet ; whereas in A. the passage immediately follows a complete couplet—lines 69–70 above. The first line and a half of B. (188–9), accordingly, has been skilfully expanded in A. into *two* lines and a half (71–3), by repeating in reverse order the “flour ageyn the leef” phrase, thus giving the complete couplet needed.¹

¹ It is of course possible to say that the one and a half lines of B. represent a condensation of the two and a half lines of A., in order to avoid this very repetition ; but it is a little complicated to suppose that Chaucer would at the same time so construct the preceding paragraph in B.—which is not found in A. at all, except that B. 180, 182 correspond to A. 90, 92—as to have it end in the middle of a couplet with the same rhyme.

Moreover, the same passage of time already implied in the substitution of *they* for *ye* is indicated by the elimination in A. 78 of the very specific reference in present time, in B. 194, to the servants of the Flower and the Leaf. And finally, the changes in two words in the last couplet are as nearly conclusive as evidence can be. For, granted the careful discrimination involved in the *werk* and *stryf* of A. 79–80, what conceivable motive could there be for substituting, not for one only, but for both, the least discriminating word in the language—namely, *thing*? On the other hand, it is scarcely too much to say that the change from this awkward repetition of a word itself not apt to the two specific and fitting words of A., constitutes in itself *prima facie* evidence of a revision in A. of the lines in B.¹

So far, then, the examination of the two versions in the light of their relation to the *marguerite* poems affords strong evidence for the priority of B.—evidence so strong, I think, as to be on grounds of technique and craftsmanship conclusive. But the adherents of the priority of A. urge for the changes they assume to have been made, resulting in B., a special

¹ Had the two passages not been separated, in the parallel printing of the two versions, by more than one hundred lines, the fact could scarcely have escaped earlier notice. With it should be compared the somewhat parallel and very suggestive case in A. 341–2 = B. 363–4, where *bokes* in A. stands for *things* in B. It will be noticed that in the preceding line in A. the specific “translate a thing” stands for the general “doon hit” of B., where “hit” has no antecedent whatever save “al this,” nineteen lines back (B. 344). Assume the change of B. 363 to A. 341, in order to supply a definite antecedent (as in the parallel case discussed on p. 678, n. 4), and the change of *things* to *bokes* is also rendered necessary to avoid repetition of the word. Assume the opposite change—that is, from antecedent to no antecedent!—and there is still no reason why the specific *bokes* should become the general *things*. It is only fair to add that the reverse change occurs in A. 330 = B. 354, where, however, corresponding fairness will probably admit that *thing* is, for its particular context, more definite than *soun*. With the passages just discussed should be compared the evidence submitted on pp. 661, n. 2; 675, n. 1, end; and 680, n. 1.

motive which forbids the judgment of the two versions purely on their artistic merits. They contend, in a word, that the original poem was revised in order to turn it more clearly into a panegyric of Queen Anne—a process, it may be admitted at once, which might well make shipwreck of the original conception. Mr. Skeat's statement of the case may be taken as typical.¹ Chaucer makes use of the liberty accorded him on February 17th, 1385—when he was allowed to nominate a permanent deputy for his Controllershship of the Customs and Subsidies—to plan a new poem, with a Prologue which should both explain his design and express his gratitude for his attainment of greater leisure.² “Having done this, he was not wholly satisfied with it; he thought the expression of gratitude did not come out with sufficient clearness, at least with regard to the person to whom he owed the greatest debt. So he at once set about to amend and alter it; the first draught, of which he had no reason to be ashamed, being at the same time preserved.”³ The conviction that the person addressed is the Queen, rests upon the evidence of the additions in B., notably ll. 83–96: “The lady whom he here addresses as being his ‘very light,’ one whom his heart dreads, whom he obeys as a harp obeys the hand of the player, who is his guide, his ‘lady sovereign,’ and his ‘earthly god,’ cannot be mistaken. The reference

¹ It will be sufficient here to refer to other well-known statements of the view—which, so far as I know, has never met opposition—that Alceste represents Queen Anne: ten Brink, *Studien*, 147–50; *Geschichte*, II, 113, 116; Koch, *Chronology*, 44–5, 52; Düring, *Geoffrey Chaucers Werke* (Strassburg, 1883), I, 268, 280–1; Bech, *Anglia*, v, 355; Furnivall, *Trial Forewords*, 106; Pollard (cautiously) *Chaucer* (Literature Primers), 95–6; Globe *Chaucer*, xlv; Mather, *The Prologue, The Knight's Tale*, etc., (1899), xxiii, xxvii; Snell, *The Fourteenth Century* (1899), 308; *The Age of Chaucer* (1901), 187–8; Bilderbeck, *Chaucer's Legend of Good Women* (London, 1902), 85 and *passim*; etc.

² Oxford *Chaucer*, III, xix, xxii.

³ Oxford *Chaucer*, III, xxii.

is obviously to his sovereign lady the queen; and the expression 'earthly god' is made clear by the declaration (in B. 387) that kings are as demi-gods in this present world."¹ In a word, Alcestis—and hence the daisy—is to be identified with Queen Anne.²

But the process does not stop here. For, Mr. Skeat continues, "if, as we have seen, Alcestis in this Prologue really meant the queen, it should follow that the God of Love really meant the king. This is made clear in B. 373-408," etc.³ Still more elaborately, however, Bilderbeck⁴ argues to the same effect, from what "appear to be definite allusions to known facts" in the description of the god of Love in B. 226-32, A. 158-64, which are as follows:

A.	B.
158. Y-clothed was this mighty god of love	226. Y-clóthed was this mighty god of love
159. Of silk, y-brouded ful of grene greves;	227. In silke, enbrouded ful of grene greves,
160. A garlond on his heed of rose- leves	228. In-with a fret of rede rose-leves,

¹ Oxford *Chaucer*, III, xxiii; cf. xxi: "The lines in which '*the queen*' is expressly mentioned [*italics mine*] occur in the later version only." Add Bilderbeck's statement, in his suggestive study just referred to, p. 85, that Chaucer in B. "justifies the introduction of the *balade* by saying that it is applicable to his 'lady souereyne,' an expression which, neither literally nor metaphorically, can be regarded as an appropriate description of the relations of Alcestis to the poet. Again, in lines 82-93 of the revised version, the daisy, which in the fable symbolizes Alcestis, is described as the flower which the poet both *loves* and *dreads*, and to which he is ever ready to render obedient service. Here, again, the poet's meaning, if his language is applied only to the daisy or to Alcestis, is far from clear. On the other hand, everything becomes intelligible if we assume that the poet intends both daisy and Alcestis to serve but as a veil to the identity of good Queen Anne."

² Skeat, *op. cit.*, III, xxiv. Lydgate's statement that Chaucer wrote the *Legend* "at the request of the quene," is also adduced (*ib.*, xx).

³ *Ib.*, xxiv.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 85-7.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 161. <i>Steked al with lilie floures newe;</i> | 229. <i>The fresshest sin the world was first bigonne.</i> |
| 162. <i>But of his face I can nat seyn the heve.</i> | 230. <i>His gilte heer was corouned with a sonne,</i> |
| 163. <i>For sekirly his face shoon so brighte,</i> | 231. <i>In-stede of gold, for hevynesse and wighte;</i> |
| 164. <i>That with the gleem a-stoned was the sighte;</i> | 222. <i>Therwith me thoughte his face shoon so brighte</i> |
| 165. <i>A furlong-wey I mighte him nat beholde.</i> | 233. <i>That wel unnethes mighte I him beholde.</i> |

The identification of the god of Love and Richard II, it appears, rests upon (1) what "seems to be an obvious reference"—in the description just quoted—"to Richard's beauty of face and his auburn or golden hair"; (2) what "seems to be a reference"—in the "lilie floures"—"to the recently-advanced claim of the English kings to the crown of France"; (3) the fact that in various pictures of Richard his robe is represented as embroidered with "circles of vetch beans," the peascod branch, the broom plant, etc., to which, accordingly, the "grene greves" seem to refer; and finally, (4) the fact that "a sun emerging from behind a cloud was one of Richard's royal devices." "I submit," says Bilderbeck, "that the significance of these various statements is unmistakable." It only remains to put the parable upon not four but nineteen feet, and identify the attendant ladies with the maids of honor of Queen Anne; and this entirely logical step has been suggested.¹ The centipedal treatment of the allegory by identifying the "tras of women" has not yet been attempted.²

¹ "Ob die neunzehn Hofdamen Alcestes ihre Urbilder in der Umgebung der Königen hatten . . . lässt sich nicht feststellen.—Düring, *op. cit.*, I, 282.

² That is no longer strictly true! For just as this article goes to the printer, comes a letter to the *Nation*, which, put on its inferences, amounts to the conjecture that the nineteen ladies were suggested by the "hundred and forty and four thousand sealed out of every tribe of the

Several things are to be noted about this theory and its corollaries. In the first place, it follows *ex hypothesi* that the identification of Alcestis with Queen Anne in A. is not clear, for the whole purpose of the assumed revision is to make it so. It is upon the references in B., accordingly, that the case must rest. Two things, now, are to be pointed

children of Israel," and the "tras of women" by the "great multitude which no man could number . . . standing before the throne and before the Lamb," in the seventh chapter of the Apocalypse! The "hymn sung by Chaucer's good women" (*i. e.* B. 296-9), moreover, is suggested by the "Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne," of the same chapter—although "a closer parallel . . . is found in Revelation xix. 1." See the *Nation* for October 20, 1904 (Vol. 79, No. 2051), p. 315. That Chaucer knew the chapter in question, as Dr. Root points out, is indisputable. But aside from the fact that the common quality of *definiteness* (and the symbolic number of the Apocalypse is anything but definite at that!) is a rather slender thread on which to hang an association of the numbers 144000 and 19—aside from such an objection, the suggestion of the passage lies close at hand in the endlessly recurring convention, in the poems of the Court of Love *genre*, of the band of lovers about the god of Love—from which, for his present purpose, Chaucer eliminates the men. See, for instance, in the *Paradys d'Amours* itself, the "compagne grande De dames et de damoiseselles," and the "grant foison de damoiseaus" (ll. 957 ff., I, 29), from whom a smaller number—twenty-eight, it happens—are set apart by name (p. 648 of the present paper). Compare also Deschamps, *Lay Amoureux* (II, 193 ff.), ll. 146 ff., where, besides the twenty-five lovers named, "de tous pays avoit gens." If one feel urgently compelled to go farther afield, one can reduce by 13976 the discrepancy referred to above by suggesting the four and twenty elders of the twenty-ninth canto of the *Purgatorio*, coming—in *procession*, be it noted—crowned with flowers-de-luce along "i fiori e l'altre fresche erbette," singing—of a woman, this time, whether it be the Virgin or Beatrice—

Benedette tue
Nelle figlie d' Adamo, e benedette
Sieno in eterno le bellezze tue (ll. 85-7).

One might even add that Dante's procession later surrounds with a hymn a mystic tree (Canto XXXII, ll. 38 ff.), as Chaucer's procession surrounds with song the daisy-flower! But with the well-known convention of such poems as Chaucer is concerned with under his very hand, the seeming parallels in Dante—and in the Apocalypse—may well be looked upon as purely accidental.

out. In the first place, as has been recently shown by Dr. Tatlock,¹ Chaucer's release from the drudgery of the custom-house was not due to Queen Anne at all, but to the Earl of Oxford—a fact which leaves the theory only the single leg of the supposed explicit verbal references to the Queen to stand on. But in the second place, it must now be clear at a glance that all these assumed allusions of Chaucer to the Queen are nothing whatever but translations of such conventional expressions as form the very warp and woof of the French poems he was imitating. For if we turn back, now, to the discussion of the specific borrowings from the *marguerite* poems and from the *Filostrato*,² it will be seen that every one of the phrases on which the identification of Alcestis with the Queen has been made to rest—the “verray light,” the “love and drede,” the “gyde,” the “erthly god,”³ the “lady sovereyne”—every one of them must be considered upon entirely different grounds from those heretofore suggested, and treated as commonplaces taken over bodily from the originals. In particular, the inference that the phrase “lady sovereyne” carries *per se* a reference to the Queen is seen to be absolutely without warrant.⁴

¹*Mod. Philol.*, I, pp. 327–8.

²See especially pp. 619–21.

³Apart from the doubtful propriety—to say nothing of the tact—involved in calling the Queen a *god* and the King a *half-god*, as Mr. Skeat's statement just quoted (p. 667) assumes, it has to be said, of course, that Chaucer did nothing of the sort. The “half goddes” of B. 387 refers to “his lordes” of B. 384.

⁴See p. 621. Mr. Skeat might have noted, but did not, that in the *Parlement of Foules*, ll. 416, 422, the phrase is applied by the tercel to the formel, who *does* probably represent Anne of Bohemia. But there once more it stands merely for the conventional relation of lover and lady, as also in the *Compleynt of Mars*, l. 215, and *Anelida and Arcite*, l. 252. Nor is Chaucer's use of the phrase “love and drede” confined to the Prologue. It occurs in the *Compleynte unto Pite*, l. 95, and in *A Complaint to his Lady*, l. 84; cf. *Troilus*, II, 1080. It may be added that in the *Compleynt unto Pite* the lady is called “Benigne flour” (l. 58), while in the *A. B. C.* the phrase “O fresshe flour” is used of the Virgin (l. 159).

Every reference in B., moreover, to the daisy as "she" or "her"¹ is again, as a glance at the French and Italian parallels will show,² simply the adoption of the convention of the type. So is "she that is of alle floures flour"; so is "The emperice and flour of floures alle."³ In a word, Chaucer's marvellous power of vivifying such a convention until it becomes more lifelike than other men's transcripts from reality—witness the unconscionable time the theory of his supposed eight years of unrequited love has been a-dying!—seems once more to have deceived the very elect.⁴

¹ B. 53, 63-4, 84 (changed to *ye* or *yow* in the succeeding lines, 86-95, but still, of course, personal), 186-7. Note the constant recurrence, none the less, to the *neuter* pronoun—e. g., *hit* (56) only three lines after *she* (53); *it* (62), *hit* (65), but *she*, *hir* in the two lines between; etc. For similar instances see what Langlois, *op. cit.*, 45, says of the *Carmen de Rosa*, and compare Skeat (Oxford *Chaucer*, III, 292, on l. 52).

² See pp. 614-15, 619.

³ See p. 614, n. 3, end.

⁴ I am indebted to Professor Kittredge for the further suggestion that the reminiscence of the death of Alceste for her husband—which, be it noted, the god of Love expressly mentions (B. 513-16)—that this reference to Alceste's choice "to *goon to helle*, rather than he" would not be, to say the least, the most tactful of allusions on Chaucer's part, if Alceste really stood for Anne, particularly when one remembers the passionate devotion of Richard to his wife. It will be recalled how characteristically this actually showed itself after her death, in 1394, in the destruction of the palace at Shene, in which she died (see Stow, *Annales* (1631), 308; *Hist. Vitæ et Regni Ric. II*, ed. Hearne, 125). Yet one is asked to believe that Chaucer, who certainly knew the feeling of the king towards his young Queen, none the less puts into his own mouth the words:

Now fele I wel the goodnesse of this wyf,
That bothe after hir deeth, and in hir lyf,
Hir grete bountee doubleth hir renoun ! (B. 520-22.)

Parables are not, of course, to be put on all fours, but Chaucer was courtier enough, one may suppose, to recognize the wisdom of pruning, where parables have to do with reigning Queens, such exuberance of fancy as might leave embarrassing interpretations open. (Is, for instance, B. 59—"Ther loved no wight hotter in his lyve"—conceivable, if the daisy is Queen Anne?) It is true—and this very plausible suggestion I owe to Mr. E. F. Piper—that Chaucer takes care at the beginning of the Prologue to state explicitly

Who, then, *is* the daisy? For the fact, already noticed, that—as Saintsbury puts it¹—“the passionate praise of the

That ther nis noon dwelling in this contree,
That either hath in heven or helle y-be (B. 5-6) ;

and that at the end the god of Love assures the poet :

Ne shal no trewe lover come in helle (B. 553).

Queen Anne's sensibilities, accordingly, need not have been offended ; the *De te, fabula!* did not, in this respect, apply to her. But after all, is not that a little too much like giving Chaucer Bottom's rôle, as who should say (since to bring in—God shield us!—such a matter touching the Queen is a most dreadful thing) : “Fair ladies, I would entreat you not to fear, not to tremble ; my life for yours, if you think I mean *that*, it were pity of my life ; no, I mean no such thing?”

Moreover, the advocates of the identity of Queen Anne and Alceste have failed to observe the rude blow dealt their theory in the change of a single word, whose significance nobody seems to have pointed out. Lines 439-440 of A., and 449-450 of B. are as follows (A in the left column) :

Al lyth in yow, doth with him what	Al lyth in yow, doth with him as
yow leste,	yow leste.
And al foryeve, with-uten lenger	I al foryeve, with-uten lenger space.
space.	

In A., *Alceste* is to forgive the poet ; in B., the *god of Love*. If one assume the priority of A., and ascribe the changes in B. to Chaucer's desire to emphasize more strongly the beneficent agency of the Queen, one has to face the remarkable fact that at the very climax of the action the hard-won forgiveness which in A. the god of Love, with exquisite tact, deposes to Alceste herself, in B. *is actually taken from her*, and granted Chaucer by the god alone ! That scarcely seems to serve the purpose of bringing, as Skeat puts it, “the expression of gratitude . . . out with sufficient clearness, at least with regard to the person to whom he owed the greatest debt” (see p. 666).

And finally, if Alceste is the Queen, it is passing strange that it should be from *her* lips that we have the couplet :

And whan this book is maad, *give hit the quene*
On my behalfe, at Eltham, or at Shene (B. 496-7).

That the figure who symbolizes the Queen should thus sharply distinguish herself from her antitype, where the words might equally well have been spoken by the god of Love, involves a gratuitous confusion of the literal and the allegorical hard to believe on the part of so skilful an artist as Chaucer.

¹ *A Short History of English Literature* (1900), p. 126.

Daisy" which one finds in the French *marguerite* poems "always, or almost always, hides or discloses affection for some living Margaret"—this fact will doubtless still be urged as a reason for holding that Chaucer's daisy can scarcely be an exception to the rule. To that the reply is clear. Chaucer *has* identified the flower with a woman, and the woman is *Alceste*—the Alceste to whom he had twice come back in the stress of the fifth book of the *Troilus*, the last time with the explicit declaration :

And gladlier I wol wryten, if yow leste,
Penelopeës trouthe and good Alceste.¹

The wider bearings of this view must be examined at another time ; it is sufficient at this point to say that in the personification of the daisy as Alceste the parallel with the French *marguerite* poems becomes complete, and to argue further that Alceste is also somebody else is to introduce into Chaucer's treatment of the theme an element of complexity which, on whatever other grounds one may attempt to justify it, is absolutely foreign to the poems whose simple formula is *marguerite* = Marguerite. To this Chaucer's explicit "Alceste, The dayesye"² is adequate parallel. And his praise—with its half promise of still more to come—in the *Troilus* itself of Alcestis as the pattern of wifely devotion, in sharp contrast with Creseyde's "untrouthe," is ample

¹ *Troilus* v. 1777-8. The other reference (v. 1527-33) is identical in substance, and in part in phraseology, with B. 511-16 :

As wel thou mightest lyen on Alceste,
That was of creatures, but men lye,
That ever weren, kindest and the beste.
For whanne hir housbonde was in jupartye
To dye him-self, but-if she wolde dye,
She chees for him to dye and go to helle,
And starf anon, as us the bokes telle.

² B. 518-19.

motive, without seeking further, for her glorification in the Prologue, once more in specific contrast with Creseyde, as "kalender . . . To any woman that wol lover be."

If Alceste is not Queen Anne, it is a work of supererogation to demonstrate that the god of Love can scarcely be King Richard. Yet the independent arguments urged for the latter identification are so fallacious, that a word regarding them seems necessary. The fact that Richard's robes are known to have been embroidered with various "grene greves"—circles of vetch beans, peascod branches, sprays of broom—is undoubtedly of archæological significance and interest; it is utterly irrelevant here. For as was long ago pointed out by Bech,¹ the model of Chaucer's lines is the famous description of the God of Love in the *Roman de la Rose*,² whose essential lines are as follows:

Il n'avoit pas robe de soie,
Ains avoit robe de floretes. . . .
Flors i avoit de maintes guises
Qui furent par grant sens assises;
Nule flor en esté ne nest
Qui n'i soit, neis flor de genest,
Ne violete ne pervanche,
Ne fleur inde, jaune ne blanche;
Si ot par leus entremesleés
Foilles de roses grans et leés.
Il ot ou chief un chapelet
De roses; etc.

As for the "gilte heer" and Richard's "auburn or golden" locks—what, really, can one say? Is the god of Love so commonly depicted with "inky brows and black silk hair," that the most frankly conventional touch one can imagine

¹*Anglia*, v, 359; cf. Skeat, Oxford *Chaucer*, III, 298.

²Ll. 888 ff.; ed. Michel, I, pp. 29–30; see Oxford *Chaucer*, I, 130–1, for the original again, with the Chaucerian translation. Dr. Furnivall's delightful suggestion (*Trial Forewords*, 106) about Queen Anne in a green gown should not, in this connection, be overlooked.

should be given "obvious reference" to a king who was himself of a fair-haired race? The allusions Bilderbeck detects in the mention of the lilies and the sun in essence rest upon the same too common fallacy—that of seeing specific references in what are but the conventions of a type.¹

The evidence for the identification of Alcestitis with Queen

¹They also involve the relations of the two versions. The *sun*, being one of Richard's devices, was, according to Bilderbeck, substituted in B. for the garland of A., out of compliment to him. But apart from the fact that the sun as a *crown* was not Richard's device, while it was a commonplace of mediæval art, a closer examination of the passage seems to point the other way. There is, to say the least, an odd mixture of the literal and the imaginative involved in the explanatory line:

In-stede of gold, *for hevynesse and wighte* (B. 231).

For if one takes the sun literally enough to abstract from it the uncomfortable heaviness and weight of gold, one is inevitably reminded of other qualities that the sun—thus brought into the realm of the literal—possesses, which might render uneasy the head that wore it. The line certainly seems to be one which mature consideration would excise rather than add. Moreover, in the two following lines of B. (232-3) it is the sun that crowns him which makes the face of the god shine so bright that Chaucer "wel unnethes mighte him beholde;" whereas in the corresponding lines of A (162-4), there is the magnificent identification, by effect, of the god's face itself with the blinding brightness of the sun, so that "a furlong-wey I mighte him not beholde." (For "furlong-wey" referring to *time*, see B. 307, and compare "But at the laste" of A. 166). In a word, we have in A. a highly imaginative, in B. a thoroughly conventional description.

As for the *lilies*, Bilderbeck explains (*op. cit.*, 103) what he regards as their omission in B.—which he refers to the year 1390 (*op. cit.*, 104)—on the ground that a three years' truce had been concluded with France in 1389; whereas in 1385 Richard was at war with France. This rests—even if one grant the identification of Richard and the god of Love—on the curious assumption that during a *truce* Richard waived all claim to the crown of France.

The passage should not be left without noting the fact, pointing once more to the priority of B., that by the substitution of *gan he* (A. 168) for *saugh I* (B. 236) the repetition of the latter in B. within three lines (see B. 234) is avoided; as A., by the change in l. 160, had avoided the repetition of *fret* in B. 225 and 228.

Anne thus shown to be inadequate, the specific motive for the supposed additions in B. falls to the ground, and with it the only reason for judging the two versions apart from technical and artistic considerations. To account for the phenomena of the B-version it becomes, accordingly, only necessary to assume that Chaucer, full of his idea of setting the Alceste of "olde story" against Creseyde, and seized by the happy inspiration of turning to his purpose the French *marguerite* poems, allowed himself to go on, adding for the sake of its beauty detail after detail as one recalled another, until his lines are like the costume of the Squyer—who might indeed himself have "wel endyted" some of them. The omissions in A. will then be amply accounted for if we suppose Chaucer to have come back to the Prologue, the spell of the *marguerite* songs no longer upon him,¹ with the unity of his plan the dominant motive in his mind.² To such considerations of technique and craftsmanship we may accordingly return.

To the arguments already based upon such grounds may be added, now, one further confirmation of the priority of B. from a comparison in detail with the originals; it will then remain to adduce the evidence from the larger structural relations that have been pointed out. Attention has already been called³ to the fact that in B. 217 and 220, Chaucer twice uses the rare word "florouns" in the same unusual sense which it has in Froissart, while the corresponding lines in A. have in each instance the common word "floures."

¹ For, after lapse of time, "wordes tho That hadden prys, now wonder nyce and straunge Us thinketh hem."—*Troilus*, II, 23-5.

² This applies even to the omission of the beautiful passage borrowed from the *Filostrato*, which is not only, as we have already seen, rather out of harmony, in its references to the "derke worlde" and "sorowful brest," with the mood of what precedes and follows it, but is also inconsistent with the compactness of structure which now characterizes A.

³ See pp. 631-4.

A.	B.
147. A fret of gold she hadde next hir heer,	215. A fret of gold she hadde next hir heer,
148. And up-on that a whyt coroun she beer	216. And upon that a whyt coroun she beer
149. With <i>many floures</i> , and I shal nat lye ;	217. With <i>florouns smale</i> , and I shal nat lye ;
150. For al the world, right as <i>the</i> dayesye	218. For al the world, right as <i>a</i> dayesye
151. I-coroned is with whyte leves lyte,	219. Y-corouned is with whyte leves lyte,
152. <i>Swich</i> were the <i>floures</i> of hir coroun whyte.	220. <i>So</i> were the <i>florouns</i> of hir coroun whyte.

It seems, for the reasons already given,¹ impossible to avoid the inference that Chaucer in B. borrowed the word "florouns" from Froissart. If that be true, it again points unmistakably to a revision in A. For the passage from an unfamiliar word, used at first because it occurred in his French original, to a perfectly familiar word, substituted when the suggestion of the French word was no longer fresh in his mind—such a change is not only intelligible, but the simple and probable thing,² while the reverse process is, to say the least, an extremely unlikely one. Nor should it be supposed that there is involved a question of a change of *meaning*. "Floures," as Chaucer uses it here, means just what "florouns" does, *i. e.*, the "whyte leves lyte" of the daisy—a phrase which he still retains, as if for the very purpose of keeping his meaning clear. That this is what it signifies will be further seen by turning to the later reference to the crown, which is common to A. and B.—

For also many vertues hadde she,
As *smale floures* in her coroun be³—

¹ See pp. 631–4.

² Compare the almost parallel instance, in the case of *clarté* and *obscur*, noted on pp. 615, n. 3, 661, n. 2.

³ A. 516–17; B. 528–9.

where the allusion is manifestly to the well-known fact which Pliny had noted. For "Plini writeth"—to use William Turner's quaint account¹—"that the Dasey hath .l.iii. and sumtime .lv. little whyte leues which go about the yelow knope"²; only, as Turner goes on to point out, "it appereth that the double Daseys were not founde in plinies tyme, whyche haue a greate dele mo then Plini maketh mencoun of." Alceste's virtues, accordingly, were as numerous—not as any arbitrary number of individual daisies one might choose to picture on her crown,³—but as the fifty and more *fleurons* of the daisy-flower itself.⁴

¹A *New Herball* (London, 1551), f. ii.

²Luteus et bellio *pastillicantibus quinquagenis quinis barbulis coronatur*. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, lib. xxi, 25 (8).

³Interesting in this connection is Deschamps's *balade*, "Sur l'ordre de la couronne" (II, 35, No. 212), with its ".xii. fleurs de grant auctorité."

⁴Two further details, which are independent of the French originals, must be added. Legouis—whose article, *Quel fut le premier composé par Chaucer des deux prologues de la Légendes des Femmes Exemplaires* (La Havre, 1900) I know, despite several attempts to secure the original, only in the reviews of Binz (*Anglia, Beiblatt*, xi, 231-7) and Koch (*Eng. Stud.* xxx, 456-8) and in a reference of Bilderbeck (*op. cit.* 77, n.)—Legouis seems to include among his arguments for the priority of A. the *tweye* of A. 346 = B. 366 (see Binz, *op. cit.*, 236; Koch, *op. cit.*, 457-8). Its reference in A. is clear from the couplet preceding; in B., however, one must go back 34 lines (and, it may be added, forward 74 lines, *i. e.* to B. 441) for mention of the *tweye* referred to. "Diese kleine unklarheit," Legouis holds, "ist eben die folge der abkürzung von A. zu B." "Das," Binz remarks, "scheint an und für sich recht einleuchtend," but suggests that the two lines may have fallen out of B. Such an assumption is, however, entirely unnecessary. For put the case that in B. Chaucer, writing *currente calamo*, forgot that what was all the while clear in his own mind had been allowed to drop for the moment from his reader's attention—a situation painfully familiar to all who write—and that on revision the slip was noted. The simple device of inserting the single couplet (A. 344-5) to supply the missing antecedent of "thilke tweyne" becomes at once self-explanatory.

Legouis seems also to use the absence from A. of the beautiful couplet B. 143-4 as an argument for the priority of the version which does not contain it. A glance, however, at the lines preceding and following the point in A. where we should naturally expect to find the couplet seems to show a diff-

If we turn, now, to the broader structural relations of the two versions, still in connection with their sources, the conclusion reached from a study of the details will find, I think, further confirmation.

Attention has already been called¹ to the fact that the B-version of the Prologue falls into two clearly distinguished parts, the first (ll. 1-196) being devoted, after the panegyric of the daisy, to an account of a day spent in its honor in the mead; the second (ll. 197-579) to the vision of the god of Love, Alceste, and the attendant ladies. In the first part there is no hint whatever of a vision, the day in the meadow being a literal day (ll. 103 ff.). The dream-setting in B. begins only with l. 210—

Me mette how I lay in the medew tho—

which forms part of the distinct paragraph made up of ll. 197-211. But in A. this paragraph, which introduces the dream, constitutes (with certain verbal differences to be noted in a moment) lines 93-106, and stands in such a position as to include *the whole of the meadow scene* within the limits of the dream. The result is that in A., instead of *two* distinct parts following the panegyric of the daisy—a day in the fields, and a vision—there is after the panegyric but *one* part, and that all vision.² Now we have already seen that

erent and interesting situation—giving us, apparently, a glimpse of Chaucer at work on his revision. For in carrying out the sort of condensation elsewhere noted (see p. 663, n. 3, for the compression of B. 71-2, 81-2 into the single couplet A. 69-70; p. 680, n. 1, for the compression of B. 202 and 211 into A. 106) part of the couplet—*i. e.* “on the braunches”—seems to have been already absorbed in A. 127. The disturbed condition of the text for A. 126-138—witness the emendations of the Globe and the Oxford editors—may be accounted for on the supposition that the revision was for some reason left at this point incomplete. The bearing, finally, of A. 544 = B. 578 has been elsewhere pointed out.

¹P. 635.

²A. 90 really stands for all the first part of B., so far as that precedes the dream.

the *Lay de Franchise* describes a May-day in the meadow spent in honor of the daisy, with no dream-setting whatever; while the *Paradys d'Amours* offers a close parallel to the framework of the vision in the second part of B. Assume, accordingly, that when B. was written the two poems just mentioned were fresh in Chaucer's mind, and it is easy to understand how, under the influence of the *Lay*, the day in the meadow should be a real day, while with the passage to the suggestion of the *Paradys* the dream-setting should enter. Assume further, as before, that when Chaucer came to revision the hold of the original poems had been broken by the passage of years, so that his growing power of unifying his material was given free play—assume this, and we have in the structural treatment an exact parallel to the treatment of detail already noted in the case of the *cento* from the *marguerite* poems: a passage, that is, through the inclusion of the entire action within the limits of the dream, from juxtaposition to fusion of parts. There is, accordingly, in addition to the artistic considerations, a reason growing directly out of the relation of the Prologue to its sources for the change from a somewhat mechanical to a more organic unity.¹ For the opposite process, that of dividing what was already united, there seems no valid reason whatever. Certainly in this instance the aid of Chaucer's supposed desire to make clearer the identity of Queen Anne and Alcestis can scarcely be invoked.

¹Note in the transposed paragraph, as further evidence for the priority of B., the elimination of the repetition of *goon to reste* (B. 198, 201) by the omission of B. 201, and of *To seen this flour* (B. 202, 211) by the fusion of the two lines into A. 106. Add the suppression of one occurrence of *naked* (B. 126, 129) by the change in A. 117. Note also that the fusion, just referred to, of B. 202 and 211 in A. 106 serves, with the addition of A. 105 (referring to A. 90), the necessary purpose of completing the couplet when the paragraph is transferred, since the paragraph as it stands in B. ends (with 211) in the middle of a couplet. If one compare these evidences of painstaking and minute revision with the similar instances cited on pp. 661, n. 2 and 665, n. 1, but one conclusion seems possible.

If we turn, now, to the treatment of the *balade* in the two versions, the case is seen to be very similar. Ten Brink, in the posthumous article on the chronology of Chaucer's writings, pointed out that in B. the *balade* formed, indeed, part of the Prologue, *but not part of the action therein represented*, whereas in A. the *balade* belongs distinctly to the action itself.¹ It is unnecessary to repeat here ten Brink's brilliant argument in this connection, but the relation already pointed out² between Chaucer's *balade* and that of Froissart in the *Paradys* seems to offer the explanation of the fact which he observed. For if the *balade* in B. was suggested by the *balade* of the *Paradys*, the setting in the latter, where it is sung by the poet in his own person, would naturally enough be carried over too. Its looseness of connection would then be quite of a piece with the other instances in B., already pointed out, of rapid and spontaneous adaptation of the French originals. Its happy transfer in A. from the poet to the attendant ladies, by virtue of which it becomes an integral part of the action, may once more be readily explained by the absence of the direct suggestion of the original, in whose place was now uppermost the instinct of the maturer artist, trained in the school of the *Canterbury Tales*, for close-knit unity of structure.³

One other point demands brief mention. Between the *bird* paragraph in B. (153-174) and the *book* paragraph in A. (268-312) the honors at first sight seem fairly easy, with

¹ *Eng. Stud.* xvii., 16-17.

² Cf. pp. 655-7.

³ This same instinct for unity is seen in the direct mention of Alceste, not only in the refrain of the *balade* in A., but throughout that version from her first appearance. It readily explains, too, the transfer by the god of Love, in A. 440, of the grant of forgiveness from himself to Alceste—a transfer so difficult to account for on the other hypothesis (see p. 672, note). For the failure to remove, in revision, the discrepancy (already noticed on p. 654) involved in Chaucer's late recognition of Alceste, the reason probably lies in the fact that the revision after the first 390 lines of B., as a glance will show (see also Binz in *Anglia*, *Beiblatt*, xi, 233-4), was manifestly most perfunctorily carried out, so that either the discrepancy was overlooked, or,

reference to their respective relations to the structural unity of the poem. But even in this regard it must be noted that the long description in B. of the mating of the birds, besides virtually repeating ll. 130–151, has really nothing whatever to do with the main action of the piece, but carries, rather, the May-day setting to quite disproportionate length; whereas what Koeppel called “die bibliographischen bemerkungen Amors”¹ are part and parcel of the central situation of the poem. Moreover, instead of the tautological and loosely constructed paragraph of B., we find in A. a compact passage of five lines (139–43) which is not only one of the most vivid and dramatic touches in the poem, but above all serves to link “the smale foules, of the seson fayn,” and through them the whole setting, directly with the main action of the poem :

This song to herkne I dide al myn intende,
 For-why I mette I wiste what they mente.
Til at the laste a larke song above:
‘I see,’ quod she, ‘the mighty god of love !
Lo ! yond he cometh, I see his winges sprede !’
 Tho gan I loken, etc.²

What is perhaps of even more importance, however, is the fact that the bird passage is a tissue of such reminiscences from the *Roman de la Rose* as one finds in Chaucer’s earlier rather than his later work ; whereas, as ten Brink observed, the book passage deals with authors and writings “die—soviel man sehen kann—Chaucer in der ersten und der zweiten periode entweder kaum oder gar nicht bekannt, während sie in der dritten periode und zumal in dem Canterbury Tales

if noticed, was seen to involve a more extensive remodelling than Chaucer now cared to undertake, and was so allowed to stand. The important thing to bear in mind is that the blunder is common to the two versions.

¹ *Anglia*, N. F. I., 175.

² It is scarcely superfluous to note, perhaps, that the reference to the “observaunces” of the birds in B. 152—“Construeth that as yow list, I do no cure”—which to say the least is unnecessary, does not occur in A., although the rhyme-syllable is unchanged.

eine entschiedene, zum theil sehr bedeutende rolle spielen.”¹ That the one should go out of B., and the other come into A., is thus entirely consistent with the other facts so far adduced.

The result of the investigation herein embodied has been to confirm, on altogether independent grounds, the conclusions already reached, as to the priority of B., by ten Brink²—a conclusion at once accepted by Koeppel,³ and later by Kaluza⁴ and Mather;⁵ but rejected by Koch,⁶ Legouis,⁷ and Bilderbeck.⁸

In a subsequent paper I hope to examine the question of the actual dates of composition and revision of the Prologue, particularly in their relation to the *Palamon and Arcite* and the *Troilus*. To this discussion has been also left the consideration of certain points—the “old age” passages, Pope Innocent’s treatise, etc.—which bear as well on the subject of the present article. Meantime, if the inferences regarding the influence of the *Lay de Franchise* on the B-version of the Prologue are sound, they seem to point definitely, for the composition of B., to a date after May 1, 1385.

JOHN L. LOWES.

¹ *Eng. Stud.* xvii. 15.

² *Ib.* 13-23.

³ *Ib.* 195-200; *Literaturblatt f. germ. u. rom. Philol.*, 1893, pp. 51-3.

⁴ *Eng. Stud.* xxii. 281.

⁵ *The Prologue, The Knights’ Tale*, etc. (1899) xxiii. n.

⁶ *Eng. Stud.* xxx. 456-8; *Chronology of Chaucer’s Writings*, 81-7.

⁷ See p. 678, n. 4. According to Bilderbeck (*op. cit.*, 77. n.), Legouis concludes that the B. text “offre des marques évidentes de progrès; il est plus plein, plus harmonieux, plus beau; il est littérairement plus parfait.” That the B. version has the note of freshness, of spontaneity, of composition *con amore* to a greater degree than A.—that it is even the more delightful version of the two—all will perhaps agree; but these are the very marks of a work written *currente calamo*, as against the firmer touch, the surer craftsmanship, the more compact unity of A.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 77-110.